"The Catholic Question in the United States"

Vol. II

John J. Vogel

By Rev. Peter Guilday

The Catholic Question in the United States

ST. MEINRAD ARCHABBEY LIBRARY IND.

108388

BQX4321
+G8
v.2

Article XXII--Archbishop John Hughes,
Champion of Religious Liberty.

(Our Sunday Visitor, June 3, 1928)

The first period of the history of our American hierarchy (1790-1815) belongs to John Carroll as its outstanding figure. The second period (1820-1842) belongs to the ablest exponent of the Catholic Faith in the United States up to the present, Bishop John England. The third period (1842-1864) is unquestionably that of John Hughes, first Archbishop of New York.

John Hughes had a singularly attractive career. He was born in Ireland in 1797, came to the United States in 1817, and in 1820 entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, to study for the priesthood. Ordained by Bishop Carroll for the Diocese of Philadelphia in 1826, he was successively stationed at St. Augustine's, St. Mary's, St. Joseph's, and St. St. John's, the last of which he built in 1832. The following three years witnessed his victory over the Rev. John Breckenridge, a Presbyterian minister of Baltimore, in acontroversy which gave Father Hughes national fame. It is to be lamented that Catholics today are not familiar with the "Discusion of the Question: Is the Roman Catholic Religion in any or in all its Principles or Doctrines, inimical to Civil or Religious Liberty?" which was published as "Oral Discussion," in 1836. This volume contains both sides of the controversy and is in reality an encyclopedia of objections against the Church by Breckenridge and of answers by Father Hughes. For the first time in the history of the Faith in this country, the doctrines of the Catholic Church obtained a hearing in almost every section of the Protestant public. Father Hughes was well liked in Philadelphia and his many friends in Protestant circles could not fail to contrast the gentlemanly Christian spirit with which he met his opponent and the scurrilous language to which Breckenridge soon descended, when he saw that the controversy was lost to his side of the argument.

Becomes Coadjutor Bishop of New York.

In 1837, John Hughes was appointed Coadjutor-Bishop of New York and was consecrated on January 7, 1838, in old

AP 24'70

St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, He succeeded Bishop Dubois on the latter's death, December 20, 1842. As coadjutor to Dr. Dubois, Bishop Hughes found himself in a position, almost similar to and as anomalous as that of Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia. Fortunately for the peace of the Church in these two leading cities, God called both Bishop Dubois and Bishop Conwell to eternal rest the same year (1842), and their passing left the way open to a final and decisive victory over the most malignant evil the Church in the United States had had to face--trusteeism.

But the great fight of Bishop Hughes' episcopate was over the common school system. The public funds for elementary education in New York were entrusted to the Public School Society and theortetically the object was "to teach religion without sectarianism." But the practice of the Society was even worse. The influence of the public school commissioners, the text-books used and the bulk of the teaching body, were all highly anti-Catholic in spirit. So much so, that the school system of New York, supported by public money raised by taxes, was a weapon of antagonism against the Catholic Faith. For two years, Bishop Hughes led the Catholics of New York against the iniquities of so un-American a situation and won his case against the Public School Society which finally went out of existence.

Exclusion of Catholics From Office.

In the midst of the excitement caused by the school controversy came the first organized party-movement towards the exclusion of Catholics frompublic office. Bishop Hughes had gained such extraordinary influence in Irish circles in New York that he was naturally singled out by the Native-Americans as their chief foe. In April, 1844, the Native-Americans paraded New York City, carrying illuminated banners with the words, "No Popery," on them, and with hidden arms, trying to provoke a riot with the Catholics. Nothing untoward occurred, since Bishop Hughes had strictly ordered his people to avoid all contact with the anti-Catholic mob. The Native-American success in Philadelphia, between May and July, 1844, in destroying several churches and in creating an unforgetable condition of rioting and bloodshed in that city, made them more eager than ever to repeat their villainous outrages in New York City. Only the valiant stand of Bishop Hughes prevented a massacre in what was then America's leading city. The Mayor, Robert H. Morris, had evidently no intention of protecting the lives and property of the Catholic citizens, until Bishop Hughes warned him that there were laws in the State Constitution which permitted such protection and hinted that were these laws

not carried out, Catholics would protect themselves in a legal manner. This could have only one meaning, and Morris Fortunately understood--there was no disturbance in New York City.

When the Know-Nothing movement became a danger to Catholic peace ten years later, Archbishop Hughes again showed his consummate prudence in warning his flock to avoid every appearance of aggression, and to face the danger with confidence that no party so thoroughly un-American could long thrive in this country. It is remarkable that New York enjoyed peace all through the turbulent days of the Know-Nothing riots in other cities.

Tribute fromHis Successor.

The present Cardinal-Archbishop of New York has penned an estimate of Archbishop Hughes in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," which deserves to be recalled to our readers: "Few public men of his day possessed a more statesmanship grasp of the genius of the American Republic. He had unbounded confidence in its institutions, when their very existence was precarious. He looked upon America as a land of promise opened by a beneficent Providence to the oppressed of the nations. No one could question his own abiding love of his native soil; but he would not permit this love to make him lament as an exile of Erin when he might rejoice as an American citizen. Thus he taught his people. So far-seeing was he in this respect that he looked with disfavor on national churches, lest they might perpetuate racial differences and foreign customs. All must be formed into a common people; and no influence could do this better for the American people, he contended, than the Catholic Church sent by Christ to teach all nations. Archbishop Hughes will ever rank among America's formost citizens. His towering character, genius for government, and intense patriotism won for him the respect and often the admiration of his opponents, the esteem and even the life-long friendship of distinguished statesmen."

Bishop Hughes addresses Congress

Archbishop Hughes was the second Catholic prelate to be invited to address Congress. It was almost twenty years after John England had done so, when in 1847, Archbishop Hughes spoke to Congress on "Christianity, the only Source of Moral, Social, and Political Regeneration." This remarkable sermon, though much shorter than that of Bishop England, follows practically the same theme--the necessity of religion, the truth of the Christian religion, and the impossibility of government unless founded upon that respect for law and order which is an essential doctrine of Christian duty.

Sent as U. S. Envoy.

Archbishop Hughes holds one of the unique distinctions which have come to members of our hierarchy--that of being entrusted as envoy extraordinary with a political mission to the Court of Napoleon lll. While in attendance at the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore (1846), he was called to Washington by Buchannan, then secretary of state, evidently for the purpose of being sent on a diplomatic mission to Mexico. This honor he politely declined, on the advice of the prelates of the Council, unless the Government gave him the full rank and title of a diplomatic representative. President Polk was unable to do this owing to the manner in which the Mexican government had treated our minister. The request made by Secretary Seward, in 1861, was of a similar kind, and this time no difficulty existed to prevent his acceptance of so high an honor. On November 2, 1861, Seward wrote to Archbishop Hughes as follows:

Sir:

You will repair to Paris and will deliver to Mr. Dayton the despatch herewith handed to you. You will, on your way thither, make yourself master of the contents by reading the copy which is confidentially entrusted to you. You will confer with Mr. Dayton upon the subject and explain to him verbally my views in desiring the fullest attainable knowledge of the dispositions of the French Goverment, whether friendly or otherwise, and especially its views on the several questions set forth in my despatch. At the same time you will be expected to do this in the most confidential manner, deferring in all cases to Mr. Dayton's judgment, and acting as auxiliary to him only at his cheerful request, and only to the extent that he thinks your relations and associations in Paris and in Europe may enable you to be useful to him.

He will be expected to receive you as a trusted, confidential, loyal and devoted citizen, who assumes this duty as much sacrifice to himself, and only on the earnest request of the President of the United States, upon mature conviction of its importance resulting from aconference with his advisers.

While in Paris, you will study how, inconjunction with Mr. Dayton, you can promote healthful opinions concerning the great cause in which our country is now engaged in arms. You will extend your visit to any part of Europe you may think proper, and will consider yourself at liberty to stay until recalled.

I have the honor to be
Your Grace's very obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

Archbishop Hughes left for Europe in November, 1861, and as his own letters indicate, it was chiefly through his consummate tact that France was prevented from following in in the footsteps of England in recognizing the Confederacy. On his return to New York on August 12, 1862, the whole city turned out to welcome him with a congratulatory address extolling the success he had in Europe in winning many statesmen to the Union cause.

The journey to Europe exhausted his strength which had never been very robust. He wento Baltimore to attend the funeral of Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, in July, 1863. On his return to New York fromBaltimore he found his episcopal city in afrenzy of excitement over the conscription quota, and at the height of the riots in July, 1863, Governor Horatio Seymour wrote to him, begging him to exert his powerful influence to put a stop to the disorder then reigning in the city. Although broken in health, Archbishop Hughes addressed a crowd of five thousand persons, who had gathered to hear him, from the balcony of his house, at 218 Madison Ave.

His Appeal for Order.

In a recent issue of "America," Mr. Thomas F. Meehan, in chronicling the sale of this house, thus describes the scene: "He came out on the balcony with Vicar-General Starrs and several other priests, but he was not able to stand up. Seated in achair, he made a long and rambling speech that plainly indicated the ravages his fatal maldy had made on him mentally as well as physically. At the end he was much exhausted and the crowd peacefully dispersed after he had given them his blessing. It was his last public appearance. He travelled during August and September in a vain search for strength, and passed the next months in a state of almost entire prostration, his vitality steadily waning until the end came as the year closed."

He died on January 3, 1864. To quote again from the biographical sketch penned by Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop Hughes "lived and passed away amid stirring times. It was providential for Church and country that he lived when he did. His natural gifts of mind and heart, independent of his education, were of a high order and made his pre-eminent in leadership. Not only was he a great ruler of an important diocese in a hierarchy remarkable for distinguished bishops, but also a masterbuilder of the Church in the United States and one of the most helpful and sagacious of the makers of America.

Church and State will ever be indebted to John Hughes, the fearless priest of God and loyal citizen of this country, for a life lived solely for the advancement of his fellow-man.

Article XXIII--Know-Nothingism

(Our Sunday Visitor, June 10, 1928)

"They never pardon, who have done the wrong!"--
No phrase describes so well the persistent Puritan intolerance existing in the United States. The "Shame of Massachusetts" in 1834 was followed by the "Shame of Philadelphia" in 1844, and the end of the next decade was to witness the most striking anti-Catholic demonstration in our history.

Cardinal Bedini's visit to U.S.

Cajetan Bedini, titular Archbishop of Thebes and Governor of the Papal State of Bologna, was appointed in 1853 Apostolic Nuncio to the Court of Brazil. Instructed by Pope Pius IX to visit the United States on his journey to South America, Bedini arrived in New York on June 30, 1853, and proceeded to Washington to present a friendly letter from the Holy Father to President Pierce. The animosity of the Protestant newspapers was immediately aroused and Bedini was accused of trying to obtain official recognition as papal envoy to this country. Even had this been his secret purpose in coming to the United States, Bedini would not have been violating diplomatic courtesy, since our country had its own Ministers accredited to the Court of Pius XI since 1847. The opposition to Bedini's presence here was led by Gavazzi, an apostate priest of Bolgna, the leader of a band of Italian revolutionists in New York City.

The Know-Nothing groups in our chief cities were then in a formative stage, and aided by Italian renegades and malcontent Irish, these anti-Catholic leaders determined to drive the Archbishop out of the country. Plots to assassinate him were formed, and public demonstrations against him were held in New York, Pittsburgh, Louisville, Cincinnati, and elsewhere; but the noble courage of the Archbishop won the protection of local authorities, although the government of the United States took no measure to guard the envoy of the Holy See from these vile outbreaks. Bedini's visit may have been ill-timed, but his incomparable dignity and fearlessness made a profound impression on all the better classes of Protestants. He remained here until January, 1854, when he returned to Rome.

Native-American Party Revived.

Bedini's visit was all that was needed to revive the animosity towards Catholics which had been sullenly quiet after the booodshed of 1844; and the old Native-American Party was revived, under the name of Know-Nothings, between 1853 and 1858. The Know-Nothing leaders had as their purpose the amalgamation into one political party of the various anti-Catholic organizations--Sons of the Sires, American Republicans, Order of United Americans, Sons of America, United American Mechanics, and others. The united group was called the Supremem Order of Star Spangled Banner, and was familiarly known as "Sam." In its published ritual, it was stated that the aim of the Order was "to protect every American citizen in the legal and proper exercise of his civil and religious rights and privileges; to resist the insidious policy of the Church of Rome and all other foreign influences against our republican institutions in all lawful ways; and to place in all offices of honor, trust or profit in the gift of the people or by appointment none but Native American Protestant Citizens."

The utmost secrecy was enjoined upon the members who were instructed to reply to all questions: "I don't know," thus winning for themselves the nickname "Know-Nothing." Within a short time, Know-Nothingism was firmly established in thirty-five states and territories, and its leaders claimed control over a million and a half of the voting population. Its candidates had won municipal elections in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore, San Francisco, New Orleans, and other cities, and in 1854 there were forty Know-Nothing representatives in Congress. The following year this number had grown to seventy-five, and it was logical that the Know-Nohting Party should enter National politics.

This opportunity came in the campaign of 1856. The two major parties at this time were the Republicans and Democrats, and the leaders of both parties realized that the entrance of the American or Know-Nohting Party into the contest was fraught with serious danger to the peace of the country. The Know-Nothing platform of 1856 contained an election slogan--"Americans must rule America." Article V of the platform reads: "No person should be selected for political station(whether of native or foreign birth) who recognizes all alliance or obligation of any description to any foreign prince, potentate or power." Article IX demanded a change in the laws of naturalization, making a continued residence of twenty-one years an indispensable requirement for citizenship.

Know Nothing Platform of 1856

Democrats Repudiated Know-Nothingism.

Democratic Platform 1856

The Democratic party platform disavowed all connection with the Know-Nothing principles, and declared that "a political crusade in the nineteenth century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign-born is neither justified by the past history of the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government."

Republican Platform

The Republican party, the legatee of the old Federalist and Whig policies, had too many anti-Catholic incidents in its career to repudiate openly the Know-Nothing platform, but it was generally known that the Republicans meant to oppose any discrimination against Catholic citizens.

The Know-Nothings nominated Millard Fillmore at Philadelphia in 1856 as their candidate for president. Opposed to Fillmore was James Buchanan, the candidate of the Democrats, and John C. Fremont, the Republican candidate. Fremont's father was a Catholic and he had himself given expression to his reverence for the Catholic Church, although he had been reared an Episcopalian. This, with other facts of a similar nature, was used against the great Pathfinder in the campaign of 1856.

Election 7/1856

The presidential election of 1856 was the first in which fullrein was given to anti-Catholic politics in this country. There can be no doubt that the Know-Nothing party expected to win a tremedous vote. The result was an astounding revelation of the popular distaste for the injection of religion into politics. Rioting occurred during the election and bloodshed during the election also; but when the votes were counted, it was seen that the Know-Nothings had been crushed in every state in the Union, except one, Maryland. "The American people," writes Peter Condon, "Had weighed the claims of the Know-Nothing party to be regarded as the saviours of the republic and had witnessed the criminal excesses to which that party had resorted in its efforts to secure political control, and the sober sense of the great mass of the people had repudiated both."

The Know-Nothing party now passed out of national politics to be succeeded some thirty years later by the American Protective Association. In local politics it held its ground

until the outbreak of the Civil War and its history during these years is a long list of outrages, rowdyism, and bloodshed.

From the standpoint of internal political peace in the United States, nothing is more regrettable than that the criminal excesses of the Know-Nothings, and of the Native Americans before them, should be forgotten by our Catholic and non-Catholic citizens. Each generation of Americans had witnessed the recredescence of this Puritan intolerance towards the Catholic Church, and if history is of any value at all to the average citizen, that value certainly is the lesson it teaches for the present problems in our national life.

Were the outrages and public violations of the law by these anti-Catholic mobs known in all their details, there would be more hesitation on the part of non-Catholics in joining similar organizations. Were Catholic citizens to know in all their details the pages that might be written on the action of the local police and civil authority which so often refused to protect the lives and the property of their co-religionists, there would be more hesitation in accepting the benign and optimistic view that such outrages cannot happen in the future. This latter fact is so appallingly evident in the history of these anti-Catholic outbreaks that they must give every honest citizen pause. Only the prudence and Christian forbearance of our bishops during the reign of Know-Nothing terror from 1853 to 1860 kept the country from witnessing that worst of all political evils--a religious war.

The Catholic Church in the United States came perilously close during these years to witnessing a constitutional amendment denying the franchise to its children.

Lincoln's Letter of Tolerance.

There was then as there has ever been in American life an overwhelming number of non-Catholics who realized the threat to the permanency of our republican institutions in each anti-Catholic movement we have had during the past century. The reaction to Know-Nothingism saw the formation of a society for the protection of civil and religious liberty in which many of the best citizens of the land secured membership. There is among the letters of Abraham Lincoln one written to a friend on August 24, 1855, which deserves to be cited:

"I am not a Know-Nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can any one who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of whitepeople? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a

nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read, 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty--to Russia for instance, where despotism can be taken pure and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

Two years later (February 23, 1857), Geroge Washington Custis, the adopted son of the first President, wrote to the Society of the Friends of Civil and Religious Liberty: "The American people have forgotten the great principles of the Revolution for which their fathers fought and bled in the times that tried men's souls, and have introduced in modern times bigotry and intolerance where all should be kindliness and brotherly love....the adopted son and last survivor of the domestic family of the beloved chief, I speak to my countrymen as with a voice from Mount Vernon, and I pray God that the Americans, seeing the error of their ways, may return to first principles: the spirit of the Revolution and civil and religious liberty."

Wise's Indictment of Know-Nothingism.

Catholics of today have little knowledge of the enormous amount of literature issued by the Know-Nothing party from 1853 to 1860. Many of these books and pamphlets were written as a reply to the gallant speech of Henry Alexander Wise of Virginia before Congress onSeptember 18, 1852.

"Why should any portion of the people," Wise had said, "desire to retire in secret and by secret means to propagate a political thought, or word, or deed, by stealth? Why band together, exclusive of others, to do something which all may not know of, towards some political end? If it is good, why not make the good known? Why not think it, speak it, write it, act it out openly and aloud?" Why should there be, he asks, a national organization bound to secrecy in such a land of liberty as the UnitedStates? "To do what? Nobody knows. How organized? Nobody knows. Governed by whom? Nobody knows. How bound? By what ties? By what test oaths? With what limitations and restraints? Nobdy, nobody knows. All we know is that persons of foreign birth and of Catholic faith are proscribed." Wise declared before the National Assembly that "Know-Nothingism is against the spirit of Reformation and of Protestantism. It is opposed to the faith, hope and charity of the Gospel. It is against the peace and purity of the Protestant churches. It is against free civil government. It is opposed to our progress as a nation." Wise's triumphant election to the governorship of Virginia in 1856 was a vindication of his stand for pure Americanism.

. Possibly the most important answer to Wise's speech was a work entitled: "The Sons of the Sires, a History of the Rise, Progress and Destiny of the American Party," by an American, published at Philadelphia in 1855. In this volume Archbishop Hughes is recognized as the most formidable living foe to the rising Puritan intolerance, and the charge is made that through the Archbishop's influence and power, the Holy See was at last beginning to stretch out its hands towards the complete control of this nation.

This common cry of thepack had been heard so long in theland that the Hon. J. R. Chandler of Pennsylvania made it the subject of an eloquent speech in the House of Representatives on January 10, 1855. There was a charge of latent treason in the accusation that the religious faith of Catholics "overrides all fealty to the government of the country and would render themunworthy of public truth--suspected citizens and dangerous officers." Mr. Chandler, a Catholic, replied to these words of Nathaniel Banks, representative from Massachusetts, taken ffom an address in which the latter said: "I will say that, if it be true that the Pope is held to be supreme in secular, as in sacred affairs, that he can absolve men from their relations with others not of the true faith, it is not strange that men should hesitate in support of his followers. I would not vote for any man holding to that doctrine, and I doubt not, other gentlemen here would concur with me in that feeling."

Chandler's Answer to Banks.

Chandler's noble answer to this age-old charge--"as old," he says, "as the hostility of paganism to Christianity," deserves to be read in full in these days. Quotations from the writings of Bishop England, Archbishop Kenrick, Archbishop Troy of Dublin, Archbishop Hughes and other prelates are given in his speech to prove the "entire political independence of every Roman Catholic outside of the Papal States." The famous Propositions of 1789 sent by Pitt to the Catholic Universities of Europe are introduced. One sentence fromChandler's speech merits repetition for its timeliness: "I deny that the Bishop of Rome has, or that he claims for himself, the right to interfere with the political relations of any other country that that of which he is himself the sovereign. I mean--and I have no desire to conceal any point--I mean that I deny to the Bishop of Rome the right resulting from his divine office, to interfere in the relations

between citizens and their governments. And while I make this denial, I acknowledge all my obligations to the Church of which I am an humble member, and I recognize all the right of the venerable head of that Church to the spiritual deference of its children; and I desire that no part of what I may say, or what I may concede, in my remarks, may be considered as yielding a single dogma of the Catholic Church, or manifesting on my part a desire to explain away, to suit the spirit of the times or the prejudices of my hearers, any doctrine of the Catholic Church."

Mr. Chandler had no need to go far afield for his answer to Banks and other Protestant antagonists who held that Catholics could not be loyal to any but a Catholic government. There were the Pastoral Letters of the American Bishops from 1829 to 1852 upon which to base his celebrated speech, the first in fact to be heard in the House of Representatives from a Catholic in defense of the Church.

The prelates of the First Plenary Council of 1852 wrote to the laity in their Pastoral Letter: "Attachment to the civil institutions under which you live has always marked our conduct.....we cannot, however, deem it altogether unnecessary to exhort you ever to discharge your civil duties from the higher motives which religion suggests....Thus will you refute the idle babbling of foolish men.....and overcome, by the sure test of practical patriotism, all the prejudices which a misapprehension of your principles but too often produces."

Chandler's speech lay almost forgotten for three quarters of a century until interest in it was recently revived, because of its similarity with Governor Smith's celebrated reply to Charles C. Marshall.

Article XXIV--Recognition of the Papacy
by American Government (1847-1867)

(Our Sunday Visitor, June 17, 1928)

Few facts are more curious in the history of American intolerance towards the Church than the recognition given to the Papacy by our government during the most intense years of the anti-Catholic political agitation.

From the eighth to the nineteenth century the Popes of Rome were recognized not only as the spiritual heads of the Catholic Church throughout the world but also as temporal lords of what was known as the State of the Church.

On the question of the historical origin of the temporal power of the papacy we do not need to enter here. Juridically based upon the free donations of Catholics and accapted by the leading governments of the eighth centry, the Patrimony of Peter, or the States of the Church, as the territory became known, was ruled by the Popes all through the medieval period well on into modern times until the year 1870, when the Papacy was robbed by the force of Italiain armies of its legal proprietary rights to the city of Rome and the surrounding principalities. As King and as Pope, the Roman Pontiffs had their representatives at different courts of Europe and America, and at the court of the Pope were the accredited ministers of many of the leading countries of the world.

The principle of separation between church and state which was written into the American Constitution did not interfere with the presence of American consular agents at Rome. In fact, American consuls were also stationed at Civita Vecchia, Ancona, and other cities in Italy. The consular fees, however, were not attractive; and, as is the custom today in many American cities, natives held these posts. There were, moreover, papal consular officers in some cities of the United States. The chief purpose of these consular agents was a commercial one, but so little exchange existed between the United States and the Papal State that the work involved in the office was rather negligible.

President Polk's Recommendation

In his annual message to Congress on Dec. 7, 1847, President Polk announced that the United States Government was considering the opening of diplomatic relations with the court of Rome, and a bill was introduced to defray the necessary expenses of the office. The proposition aroused intense feeling throughout the country, and the leader of the opposition was Representative Lewis C. Levin of Pennsylvania. Levin is now known to have been directly implicated in the Philadelphia riots of 1844, and in a lengthy speech in the House of Representatives in 1848, he assailed the Church in a manner which brought upon him the stern displeasure of his colleagues fromPennsylvania.

On March 2, 1848, Levin who may well be taken as the prototype of the fanatical anti-Catholic, began an attack in the House on the bill with these words: "Mr. Chairman, I have been so often misrepresented by the paid agents of the Jesuits who hang around this Hall and who swarm over our land, that I have come prepared today." There follows a long speech filled with diatribe and calumny against Pius IX and the Catholics of this country. He openly accused President Polk of promoting the Roman legation because of a "wonderful and newly-awakened sympathy for Rome" which had as its cause "the increase of the Roman Catholic vote." Without mentioning the name of Archbishop Hughes, Levin claimed that the creation of the embassy at the Court of Pius IX was "the work of an intriguing, restless, grasping, and ambitious priest, who fans in his bosom the nefarious hope that he is himself to be the destined organ between a free republic and an absolute hierarch."

Among the many reasons Levin gives as militating against the legation are these: "Has Pius IX absolished titles: Has he granted universal suffrage to his subjects? Has he introduced trial by jury? Has he abolished the college of cardinals? Has he struck down the power of the confessional? Has he repealed the demoralizing edict of celibacy? Has he absolished that pest-house of intrigue and pernicious propagandism, the Society of Jesus? He has done none of these things. Then, what has he done to entitle him to the sympathy of the people and the homage of the Government of the United States? Nothing."

Levin's Prophecies and Threats

Levin was alarmed at the "flood of immigration sweeping its millions of foreign Roman Catholics over the land," and asserted that "this country seems destined to be the grand theatre of Roman Catholic power--not American papistry, but the papistry of Rome--of the Old World--of Austria and of the Pope." The rest of the speech is an attack upon the Jesuits and their educational institutions in this country, and a fling is taken at the Leopoldine Association of Vienna and other charitable Catholic missionary societies then assisting American Catholics generously in upbuilding the Church here. "Pass this bill, if you will," he concludes, "and I will tell you that the heart of the nation will be reached, that the American people will awaken from their slumber, and that Native Americanism will be at last understood and properly appreciated. Pass your bill, and from that hour Native Americanism meas only the defence of Protestant rights and Protestant freedom against Papal tyranny and Jesuit aggression."

Rebuked by Henry W. Hillard, representation from Alabama, for his want of liberality in religious matters, Levin attempted to reply, when he was interrupted by Charles Brown of Pennsyvania who said: "Yes! He--(pointing to Mr. Levin)--the gentleman fromPennsylvania--was the first to introduce the incendiary subject of religion into politics of Philadelphia, and by his inflammatory harangues, produced all the incendiarism and bloosshed that for a while covered it with gloom and disgrace. Yes, sir, he was the author of all the incendiary measures--" here the Speaker intervened and called Brown to order. Charles Jared Ingersoll, of Pennsylvania, then arose to ask why Mr. Brown was out of order, and the session adjourned in "great confusion and excitement," to use the words of the "Congressional Globe" of that day.

A few days later (March 8, 1848), Ingersoll took the floor and made a spirited defence of Archbishop Hughes and of Pius IX, paying a glowing tribute to the Jesuits of Georgetown College. "For fifty years," he said, "those Jesuit Fathers have been disseminating the doctrines of human freedom, as well as the treasures of science to the youth of American, and not an instance has occurred of anything to their dishonor."

Ingersoll's analysis of the Native-American riots in Philadelphia in 1844 was a crushing rejoinder to Levin whom he pilloried as a common bargainer in votes, using his influence with

the Native American party at the behest of the highest financial bidder. The bill to establish the legation in Rome passed by a vote of 137 to 15 in the House of Representatives and by an equally large majority in the Senate, and on April 1, 1848, Jacob L. Martin was appointed by Secretary Buchannan as American Minister to the Papal States.

Relations With Vatican Lasted 20 Years

The diplomatic relations thus begun lasted for twenty years and the archives of the Secretary of State contain considerable material in the way of letters, despatches and reports which throw considerable light on American Catholic history and on the international problems created by the "risorgimento" policy of Young Italy. In some of these state papers we find an expression of opinion which has a distinct connection with the history of the Catholic Question in the United States. For example, in Secretary Buchanan's earliest instructions to Minister Martin, we read: "There is one consideration which you ought always to keep in view in your intercourse with the Papal States. Most, if not all, the governments which have diplomatic representatives at Rome, are connected with the Pope as the head of the Catholic Church. In this subject the government of the United States occupies an entirely different position. It possesses no power whatever over the question of religion. All denominations of Christians stand on the same footing in the country, and every man enjoys the inestimable right of worshipping his God according to the dictates of his own conscience." These are precious words from our government, since they were written at the very time Catholics were being assailed by antagonists who were bent on curtailing that right if possible.

Minister Martin Captivated by Pope

Martin dispatches show that he was captivated with the liberal-mindedness of Pius IX. Martin lived but a year, dying at Rome on August 26, 1848. He is buried there. His successor, Lewis Cass, Jr., served until 1858 and was singularly fortunate in his attitude towards the unstable Republic which Mazzini had succeeded in creating at Rome in 1848. The eloquence and forcible logic of Archbishop Hughes of New York was bringing home to Catholic and non-Catholic alike at the time the irregular proceedings of the Italian revolutionsts, and in away his discourses on the flight of the Pope to Gaeta were a warning to our government that the sacrilegious invaders of the Eternal City did not merit recognition.

Offer of Asylum to Pope

Cass was succeeded by John Porter Stockton, who presented his credentials to Cardinal Antonelli, late in 1858. Pius IX had returned in triumph from Gaeta in 1850, but it was visible to all that the movement for the unification of Italy was too powerful to be stopped. After the fall of Naples in 1860, Stockton asked for his recall (April 2, 1861), and Rufus King was appointed as his successor. Seward's instructions to King were explicit indications to the Holy See that the United States had no desire to violate friendship with the Papal States by taking any part in the political revolution which had the capture of Rome as its objective. King soon resigned to accept the post of brigadier-general in the Union Army, and was succeeded by Alexander Randall, who remained but a short time, and by Richard W. Blatchford. General King was again appointed to the Holy See in October, 1863, and there was much question at the time whether it would not be prudent for Pius IX to take refuge in the United States. When the question was broached to King, the American Minister replied that the United States "was the home of civil and religious liberty as well as a refuge of all who fled from political and other troubles in the old world, and that His Holiness, should he see fit to go to the United States, would no doubt meet with a kind welcome and be left to pursue, unquestioned and unmolested, his great work as Head of the Catholic Church." Archbishop Hughes had already visited Pius IX when this matter was being seriously discussed through diplomatic channels, and Pius IX expressed to the American Minister his great appreciation that the New York prelate had been entrusted with a mission so fraught with noble possibilities for the preservation of the American Union.

Approval of Confederacy

It was during the incumbency of Minister King that the Holy See was approached by the Confederacy, not exactly for recognition as a separate state, but as sign that the Southern leaders fully appreciated the value of the sympathy of so great a liberal statesman as Pius IX. The occasion of the correspondence was an Apostolic Brief sent by the Pope to Archbishop Hughes of New York and to Archbishop Odin of New Orleans, on October 18, 1862, requesting these two prelates to use every possible means to bring the awful slaughter of the Civil War to an end.

The Holy Father said in his letter:

"Wherefore we write you this letter, in which we urge you, Venerable Brother, with all the force and earnestness of our mind, to exhort, with your eminent piety and episcopal zeal, your clergy and faithful to offuer up their prayers, and also apply all your study and exertion, with the people and their chief rulers, to restore forthwith the desired tranquility and peace by which the happiness of both the Christian and the civil republic is principally maintained. Wherefore omit nothing you can undertake and accomplish, by your wisdom, authority and exertions, as far as compatible with the nature of the holy ministry, to conciliate the minds of the combatants, pacify, reconcile, and bring back the desired tranquility and peace, by all the means that are most conducive to the best interests of the people.

"Take every pains, besides, to cause the people and their chief rulers seriously to reflect on the grievous evils with which they are afflicted, and which are the result of civil war, the direst, most destructive and dismal of all the evils that could befall a people or a nation. Neither omit to admonish and exhort the people and their supreme rulers, even in our name, that with concilated minds they would embrace peace, and love each other with uninterrupted charity. For we are confident that they would comply with our paternal admonitions and hearken to our words the more willingly as of themselves they plainly and clearly understand that we are influenced by no political reasons, no earthly considerations, but impelled with your surpassing wisdom, to persuade all that true prosperity, evein in this life is sought for in vain outside of the true religion of Christ and its salutary doctrines. We have no hestitation, Venerable Brother, but that calling to your aid the services and assistance even of your associate bishops you would abundantly satisfy our wishes, and by your wise and prudent efforts bring a matter of such moment to a happy termination."

Jefferson Davis' Letter to Pope

On September 23, 1863, J. P. Benjamin, Secretary of State, for the Confederacy, wrote to A. Dudly Mann, then Confederate Commissioner to Belgium, enclosing a letter from Jefferson Davis to the Holy Father, and ordering Mann to go to Rome at once and present the Confederate President's letter to Pius IX. This letter was as follows:

"Executive Office,
"Richmond, Sept. 23, 1863.

"Most Venerable Chief of the Holy See
and Sovereign Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church:

"The letters which your Holiness addressed to the venerable chiefs of the Catholic clergy in New Orleans and New York have been brought to my attention; and I have read with emotion the terms in which you are pleased to express the deep sorrow with which you regard the slaughter, ruin and devastation consequent on the war now waged by the Government of the United States against the States and People over which I have been chosen to preside; and in which you direct them, and the clergy under their authority, to exhort the people and the rulers to the exercise of mutual charity and the love of peace. I am deeply sensible of the Christian charity and sympathy with which your Holiness has twice appealed to the venerable clergy of your church urging them to use and apply all study and exertion for the restoration of peace and tranquility.

"I, therefore, deem it my duty to offer to your Holiness, in my own name and in that of the people of the Confederate States, the expression of our sincere and cordial appreciation of the Christian charity and love by which your Holiness is actuated, and to assure you that this people, at whose hearth-stones the enemy is now pressing with threats of dire oppression and merciless carnage, are now, and ever have been, earnestly desirous that this wicked war shall cease; that we have offered at the footstool of our Father Who is in Heaven prayers inspired by the same feelings which animate your Holiness; that we desire no evil to our enemies, nor do we covet any of their possessions, but are only struggling to the end that they shall cease to devastate our land and inflict useless and cruel slaughter upon our people, and that we be permitted to live at peace with all mankind, under own laws and institutions, which protect every man in the enjoyment not only of his temporal rights but of worshipping God according to his own faith.

"I, therefore, pray your Holiness to accept from me, and from the people of the Confederate States, this assurance of our sincere thanks for your effort to aid the cause of peace, and of our earnest wishes that your life may be prolonged and that God may have you in His holy keeping.

"Jefferson Davis,
"President Confederate States of N. America."

Pope's Reply to Davis.

The following December, Pius IX replied to Davis, addressing him by his title: "President of the Confederate States of America," and thanking him for the gratitude expressed in his letter of September 23. "Would to God," the Pope wrote, "that the other inhabitants of these regions (the Northern people) and their rulers, seriously reflecting upon the fearful nature of intestine warfare, might, in a dispassionate mood, hearken to and adopt the counsels of peace!" These words caused considerable excitement at the time and the old charge of the Catholic Church being leagued with the slave-owners was revived. The Draft Riots in New York City in July, 1863, in which one thousand persons were killed or wounded, gave the enemies of the Catholics another opportunity to press the charge of disloyalty, and the letter of Pius IX did not help to ally this suspicion.

It was fortunate that we had a resident Minister at Rome at the time, for Rufus King was clear-headed enough to keep our government properly informed of the Holy Father's peaceful intentions. Davis and the other Southern leaders realized that Pius IX had not recognized the Confederacy by his letter. Secretary Benjamin, in fact, called the use of President Davis' title "a formula of politeness, not a political recognition of a fact."

The American legation at the Court of Pius IX lasted through the War, but came to an official end in 1867, when Congress refused to appropriate the money necessary for its upkeep. Had an American Minister been resident in Rome in 1870 when the Italian army took the Eternal City, the question of the Pope's taking refuge in the United States might have been revivied, and had Pius IX come here, the international complications involved in his presence outside of Rome might have produced an immediate settlement of the Roman Question. As a young priest Pius IX had visited South America, and more than one of its Catholic governments hoped that he would return rather than submit to the indignity of an imprisonment which the New Italian state practically forced him to accept and which his successors since 1870 have shared, to the admiration of the Catholic world.

Article XXV--The Catholic Church and the Slave Question (1830-61)

(Our Sunday Visitor, June 24, 1928)

That the Catholic Church in the United States should escape the fierce antagonisms created by the Abolition movement was hardly possible during those years of intense moral and political discussions on the slave question (1830-1861).

Societies for the purpose of abolishing slavery in this country existed from the beginning of the Republic. Benjamin Franklin was president of one founded in Philadelphia in 1775 and John Jay was president of another begun in New York in 1785. Other societies were organized in the different States and were to a slight degree instrumental in the abolition of the slave trade by the Federal government in 1808.

Eight years later the American Colonization Society was founded at Washington, D.C., for the purpose of securing a home for free Negroes, preferably in Africa. The hidden object of the Society was to free the South of those free Negroes who were a menace to white control over the slaves. In 1820, during the presidency of Charles Carrollton, the Society sent out its first colony to Africa, and two years later a permanent settlement was made at Cape Mesurado. For the next quarter century the Society managed the colony, but on July 26, 1847, it declared itself an independent republic consisting of four counties, one of which was called Maryland. The capital was called Monrovia after President Monroe.

Catholic Liberians.

Among the first colonists were Catholic Negroes from Maryland and Virginia, and their spiritual care was discussed at the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore (1833). While in Rome, in May, 1833, Bishop John England submitted to the Holy See a memorial regarding the establishment of a Catholic Mission in Liberia, and although his advice was not followed by the prelates of the Council, a decree was ordered stating that the care of the Catholic Liberians should be entrusted to the Soc-

iety of Jesus. As a result nothing was done, and Bishop England chafed under what he considered the culpable neglect of our hierarchy in not providing for the growing problems created by Abolitionism.

Bishop England was not unaware of the splendid pages that might be written on Catholic missionary activities among the colored people during the colonial and national periods of our country's history, but he believed that the whole force of Catholic doctrine should be brought to bear upon a question which was fast dividing the United States into two distinct territories. Personally he was opposed to slavery, but he knew that alone he could accomplish nothing. What he wished for was a restraining influence from Catholic leaders upon the radical demands of the Abolitionists and the infiltration, into this greatest problem the United States has had to solve, of the realization that only gradually might slavery be abolished. He knew American politics too well not to see that the Abolition movement was strongly bound to the anti-Catholic forces of the Nativists.

Probably, it was his regret over the silence of the Council of 1833 which induced him, imprudently, to open a school for free Negroes in Charleston, in 1835. The Negro insurrection of 1820, under Denmark Vesey, and in 1831, under Nat Turner, had been put down with a cruel hand, and Southerners generally saw in the fearful massacre of whites committed by Turner and his followers the direct result of Abolition literature upon the Negroes. In September, 1836, a mob broke into the postoffice at Charleston and destroyed all the Abolition literature in the mail which had arrived the day previous. The word got abroad that Bishop England had received and retained one of the anti-slavery tracts and for several days the Cathedral, Bishop's House, Seminary and Convent had to be guarded.

Dr. England at this time was America's foremost Catholic citizen, and Southerners in general knew that his influence on the slave question was the strongest in Catholic circles. He had won their approval by his published rebuke to his friend, Daniel O'Connell, some years before, in which he accused the Liberator of unwarranted interference in the domestic affairs of the United States through his alliance with the Abolitionists.

Church's Dilemma Over Slave Problem.

The Catholic Church here was in a sore dilemma over the slave problem. The Holy See had repeatedly condemned the slave-

trade from 1482 to 1839, but had not condemned slavery itself as a social institution. The Apostolic Brief of Gregory XVI in 1839 made this distinction, and Bishop Kenrick in his "Moral Theology," which came out shortly afterwards, upheld slavery as permissible. The scholarly Bishop of Philadelphia regretted that so many Negroes should be held in bondage in the land of freedom, but he added that "nothing against the law should be attempted, done or said, which would make them (the slaves) bear their yoke unwillingly." This placed the Church on the side of the slave-owners and the reaction in Abolition circles was to increase the animosity then alive against American Catholics. This factor must be remembered in estimating the causes for the rapid spread of Native-Americanism and Know-Nothingism from 1840 to 1861.

After the appearance of Gregory XVI's letter on the slave-trade, it was immediately made use of as a party weapon by Forsyth, Van Buren's Secretary of State, in August, 1840, against General Harrison, the first presidential candidate put forward by the Whigs and the Anti-Slavery party. Bishop England immediately took up the issue in favor of domestic slavery and interpreted the Holy Father's letter as simply condemning the slave-trade. There is little doubt that the stand taken by Bishop England tended considerably to influence American Catholics in favor of domestic slavery. Dr. England's "Letters to Forsyth" are among the strongest from his pen, but the damage had already been done and Catholics were generally ranked with the slave-owners, as many contemporary letters and publications reveal.

Bishop England's Position.

The silence of the other American prelates of the time gave strength to this belief and the election of William Henry Harrison as ninth President of the United States in 1840 was everywhere acclaimed as a victory over all slave-owning interests, the Catholic Church included. Bishop England was asked by many during the heat of the campaign where he personally stood on the question, and he replied in the last of his letters to Forsyth (Feb. 23, 1842): "I have been asked by many, a question which I may as well answer at once, namely: Whether I am friendly to the existence or continuation of slavery? I am not--but I see the impossibility of now abolishing it here. When it can and ought to be abolished, is a question for the legislature and not for me."

Pope Gregory's letter was read in the Fourth Provincial Council of Baltimore (1840), but in spite of the widespread agitation it had caused, no action was taken by our prelates, and again their silence was misinterpreted by anti-Catholic Abolitionists who found it difficult to see how the Church could remain neutral on a question that was fast splitting the Union into two parts.

As a result of the presidential election of 1840, Catholics, who in the main had voted with the Democrats, were now regarded as traitors to that party; and the Republicans, many of whom had been instrumental in the formation of the Native-American party, felt no obligation towards them, although their vote had helped Harrison to win the election. The result was that Catholic influence with both parties was weakened during the very years when protection was badly needed for safeguarding their civic rights. Chief Justice Roger B. Taney's decision in the Dred Scot case in 1857 added weight to the anti-Catholic attitude of the Abolitionists, since it clearly showed that America's first Catholic Chief Justice was a friend of the slave system.

It has been customary for Catholic writers to picture the Church here as entirely aloof from the intense agitation on the slave question during the score of years before the Civil War and "to have emerged from the gloom of civil strife presenting a united front to meet the new conditions that emancipation gave birth to." To accept this is to forget a famous passage at arms between Archbishop Hughes and Dr. Brownson in 1861.

Clash of Catholic Leaders.

Dr. Brownson's article, "Slavery and the War," recommending the immediate emancipation of slaves as a war measure, contained the following paragraph: "The Church is never content with simply disapproving of slavery. She regards it as a wrong and an outrage upon humanity....She requires each and every individual to do what he can as a member of the community to induce it to take action necessary for redressing it. This is a point which Catholics too often overlook. Because the Church does not make the immediate emancipation of the slaves a condition 'sine qua non' of abolition, they are apt to conclude that she does not oppose slavery and that they are not required by their religion to make active efforts for its abolition."

There were of course many Catholic Abolitionists in the North and South, and Brownson's utterances may be taken as the

echo of their displeasure over the fact that the prelates of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852) ignored the slave question. Archbishop Hughes lost no time in answering Dr. Brownson in his official organ, "The Metropolitan Record." As a young man at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, he had been an ardent Abolitionist--one of his poems contains the striking line:

"--chase foul bondage from her Southern plain,"

but later in life he came to believe that emancipation would be a fatal social blunder. His answer to Brownson is a severe arraignment of the great apologist's theological learning, and he went "to such lengths in the extenuation of slavery that he was accused of favoring the slave-trade." The truth is that Catholics on both sides of the question were supporting their stand by an appeal to theological traditions and literature, and that the ranks of Catholic leaders were to all practical purposes, as divided as those of other Christian churches in the United States.

The action of our prelates in not facing the problem boldly and in not offering to a distracted country a plan of emancipation based upon the policy followed out by the Church in former ages for the gradual freedom of the slaves may have been prudent, but it was unfortunate that no great leaders arose to win the attention of the protagonists on both sides of the problem. As a result the Church was alienated from the anti-slavery groups of the North and was not welcomed by the slave-owners of the South where anti-Catholic prejudices were too strong to be overcome. The Church in the United States was not at the time a relatively large one in proportion to the whole population, but it was the largest Christian religious society in the land. That Catholicism emerged from the conflict united was due to the unity of the Faith and to Church administrative principles.

Second Plenary Council's Pronouncement.

When the war was over, the problems connected with the emancipated slaves were freely discussed at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore '1866), and in their Pastoral Letter to the Laity, the prelates said: "We could have wished that in accordance with the action of the Catholic Church in past ages, in regard to the serfs of Europe, a more gradual system of emancipation could have been adopted, so that they might have been in some measure prepared to make a better use of this freedom, than they are likely to do now." Had this message been given in the eight Councils preceding that of 1866, the Catholic Church would have found itself ranged alongside the best men of both parties; and with the Post-Civil War period in view, it

is regrettable that our leaders did not analyze the slavery issue more adroitly.

Nor must it be forgotten that, in spite of its admirable record in certain localities for the amelioration of the social and moral conditions of the slaves, the first organized effort in the United States to win the souls of the colored people after the Civil War was carried out by the priests of Mill Hill who came here from England in 1871. It was twenty-one years later (1892), before the American Church accepted the whole burden of the spiritual care of our colored citizens through the establishment of the Society of St. Joseph. There are few Catholic notes in the Reconstruction of the South between 1866 and 1876.

Out of the difference of opinion on the slave question one effect which had already taken place was gradually made apparent in the field of politics, namely, the end of the identity between the Democratic party and Catholic voters, with the result that the Catholic Question in the United States was removed frompolitics for almost a generation.

Article XXVI-American Catholics During the Civil War (1861-65)

(Our Sunday Visitor, July 1, 1928)

In a superb essay on "Obligations to America," Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University lays down a principle which cannot be too often repeated to Catholics in this country: "The loyalty of American Catholics to this country need not hangin the balance one instant, if they will but take higher and firmer ground. Let them advance boldly and grasp the significant truth that America is the daughter of the Catholic Church.....Turn wheresoever you will in these United States and study any institution or any ideal which has been commonly regarded as an aspect of true Americanism and you will discover that no matter who is immediately responsible for its erection or formulation, its embryo and antitype are to be found in Catholic theory and practice. This is what I mean by insisting that America is a daughter of the Catholic Church."

In a booklet on the subject, "American Democracy and Catholic Doctrine," Sylvester J. McNamara has summarized for us the immediate sources of our American free institutions and in particular the sources of the Declaration of Independence, and has shown conclusively that the Political philosophy back of American freedom came to the Founders of the Republic straight from the heart of the Catholic Church.

This fact has not, however, been sufficiently emphasized by our Catholic American writers, and instead of finding Catholic political philosophy held in esteem by all who are enjoying the fruits of American liberty, the Catholic Church in this country has had to face a decennial madness composed of prejudice and ignorance in which her most sacred obligations to America are made the subject of vicious and unwarranted onslaught. None of these attacks strikes the Church more sensitively than the charge so often made against the loyalty of Catholic Soldiers and Sailors during our wars. Face to face with the glorious response of our Catholic citizens during the World War of 1914-1918, anti-Catholic antagonists dared not impugn the loyalty of those of the Household of the Faith. But they were not to be silenced. Records were searched to find

occasional lapses on the part of Catholic soldiers, and the honor of the Catholic priests and solders of this last world conflict was attacked indirectly through those forgotten pages of t he past. Two of these falsehoods appear periodically in the anti-Catholic press--the desertion of Catholic soldiers in the Mexican War and the attempt to prove that seventy-two per cent of the deserters in the Civil War were Irish Catholics. Both charges have been answered by Mr. Thomas T. Meehan in the "Historical Records and Studies" of 1918-1919. But those who continue making these charges have no intention oflearning the truth.

Bigotry During Mexican War.

The recruiting for the Mexican War was made the avenue for an anti-Catholic campaign which had considerable effect upon the Mexicans once actual warfare began. "When volunteers were called for," writes John Gilmary Shea, "the feeling of hostility to the Catholic Church was manifest, and boasts were loudly made that our soldiers were to enrich themselves with the spoils of the Catholic churches. The spirit even reached the regular army, and Catholic soldiers near the frontier were, in utter disregard of the Constitution of the United States and the spirit of our institutions, compelled, under threats of severe punishment, to attend the services of the Protestant religion, established in the United States Army, and to listen to violent denundations of their own faith." One good result of the bigottry, however, was the appointment of chaplains for the troops engaged in the War with Mexico, and two Jesuits, Father Anthony Rey, of Georgetwon College, and Father John McElroy, of Frederick, were sent to the front.

When the Civil War broke out in 1861, the first thought of those leading Catholic regiments, or regiments in which a large number of the soldiers was of the Faith, was to provide for their spiritual welfare. Among these Chaplains with the Union forces were Father John Ireland, the future Archbishop of St. Paul, who was with the Fifth Minnesota regiment; Father Louis A. Lambert, of the Eighteenth Illinois regiment; Father Lawrence McMahon, later Bishop of Hartford; Father Bernard McQuade, later Bishop of Rochester; the Jesuit Fathers O'Reilly, Cuilette, O'Hagan, and Tissot, and the great chaplain of the battle of Gettysburg, Father Corby, of Notre Dame. With the Confederate forces were Father Francis Leray, later Archbishop of New Orleans; Father Abram Ryan, the "Poet Priest of the South;" Father Hamilton, of whom it was said at the time that he was the only clergyman with sufficient heart and charity to visit the 33,000 prisoners in Andersonville prison of horrible fame; Father Peter Whelan,

who was a chaplain-general of the Southern armies, and many others.

Participation of Catholics in Civil War

There is an excellent summary of participation of loyal Catholic Northerners and Southerners in the Civil War in an article by Dr. Henry Gratan Doyle in the "Catholic Builders of the Nation." The list of rpominent officers in both armies who were members of the Catholic Church is a suprisingly large one, and some of these names should be made familiar to the boys and girls in our Catholic Schools--General Thomas F. Meagher, Colonel James A. Mulligan, General Philip H. Sheridan of whom Grant said that he had "no superior as a general, either living or dead, and perhaps not an equal," General William Starke Rosecrans, one of the greatest soldiers the United States has ever seen, and others in the Union Army. On the Southern side we meet with General P. G. T. Beauregard, one of the most picturesque figures of the War; General James Longstreet, who became a Catholic after the War was over; Stephen R. Mallory, Secretary of the Navy in Jefferson Davis' cabinet, and Captain (later Admiral) Raphael Semmes, who commanded the "Alabama" from August, 1862, until she was sunk by the "Kearsarge" in June 1864, but not before she had captured some sixty-five Northern warships and other vessels and had inflicted millions of dollars of damage on Northern commerce.

By far, however, the greater glory of Catholic Participation in the Civil War has gone to the nuns of the battlefield. The Red Cross was unknown at the time, but Catholic nursing Sisters for the wounded and dying performed so efficient a part in the struggle that there was erected recently by the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, in the city of Washington, a monument to the "Nuns of the Battlefield." Twelve different Sisterhoods are represented on the large bronze tablet on the front of the monument which bears the inscription: "Erected by the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America to the memory, and in honor of, the members of the various Orders of Sisters who gave their services as nurses on battlefields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals in the wars in which the United States has engaged." The monument faces the place where Rhode Island and Connecticut Avenues meet and is across from St. Matthew's Catholic Church, where for many years Monsignor Thomas Simms Lee was pastor.

400 Nuns Acted as War Nurses

On March 18, 1918, Hon. Ambrose Kennedy of Rhode Island, spoke at length upon the resolution for the erection of this memorial. Mr. Kennedy was able to show by documentary evidence

Southern armies, and

Catholics in Civil War

There is an excellent summary of participation of
loyal Catholic Northerners and Southerners in the Civil War
an article by Dr. Henry Grattan Doyle in the "Catholic Buil
of the Month." The list of prominent officers in both armies
who were members of the Catholic Church is a surprisingly l
one, and some of these names should be made familiar to the boys
and girls in our Catholic Schools--General Thomas F. Meagher,
Colonel James A. Mulligan, General Phil[illegible]. Sheridan of whom
Grant said that he had "no a general, either living
or dead," and perhaps not excepting "General William Starke Rose-
crans, one of the greatest soldiers the United States ever
saw," and others in the Union Army. On the Southern side we
meet with General [illegible]. T. Beauregard, one of the most picturesq
que figures of the Civil War; General James Longstreet, who became a
Catholic after the War was over; Stephen [illegible] Mallory, Secretary
of the Navy in Jefferson Davis' cabinet, and Judah Philip (Jewish
ancestral) Benjamin, who composed the "Algiers" from August,
1862, until and was sung by the "Pearsarge" in June 1864, but not
before she had captured some sixty-five Northern merchantmen and
other vessels and had inflicted millions of dollars of damage on
Northern commerce.

By [illegible], however, the great ex Glory of Catholic Participat-
ion in the Civil War has gone to the tombs of the battlefields.
The Red Cross was unknown at the time, but Catholic Nursing Sis-
ters for the wounded and dying performed no efficient & part in
the struggle that there was erected recently by the Ladies' Aux-
iliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, in the city of Wash-
ington, a monument to the "Nuns of the Battlefield." Twelve
different Sisterhoods are represented on the large bronze tablet
on the front of the monument which bears the inscription: "Con-
secrated by the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians
in America to the memory, and in honor of, the members of the
various Orders of Sisters who gave their services as nurses on
battlefields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals in the waters
in which the United States has engaged." The monument faces
the place where Bruce Island and Long Island Avenues meet and is
across from St. Matthew's Catholic Church, where for many years
Monsignor Thomas Dinnie Lee was pastor.

400 Nuns Acted as War Nurses

On March [illegible], 1918, Archbishop Kennedy of Rhodes Island,
wrote at length upon the resolution for the erection of this
tablet. He. Kennedy was able to show by documentary evidence

that nearly four hundred Catholic Sisters acted as war nurses from 1861 to 1865. "They brought into the work," he says, "a skill and discipline which had long been prominent features of their daily training and experience. Hence the unique character of the services they rendered during the entire period of the War. At the very moment of their enlistment they were admirably equipped for the task, and a hard and laborious task it was, but they met and discharged it as a duty of sacrifice every moment of the day and night, animated only by an undying love of country and the spirit of Christian charity and zeal."

The Sisters whom he eulogized that day were members of eight different religious congregations: Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Daughters of Charity of New York and Cincinnati, Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, and the Ursulines. "The records of the War," Mr. Kennedy says, "do not register a single instance of failure or shirking on the part of these Sisterhoods....No page in all our history can present nobler deeds of courage and devotion."

One of the factors of the post-Civil War period which is being gradually brought to light by the researches of Dr. Scannell O'Neill is the large number of converts among army men who first came in contact with the Catholic Faith through the nuns of the battlefield. A list of these converts recently published reveals the names of twenty-nine officers of high rank in the Union Army and fourteen in the Confederate Army who entered the Church during and after the Civil War.

The great assembly of Archbishops and Bishops at Baltimore in October, 1866, for the Second Plenary Council, was not unmindful of this aspect of the Sisters' presence at the front and in the hospitals, and in one of the most eloquent pages ever written to the laity, the prelates of the Council pay a tribute to the nuns which merits remembrance: "We discharge a grateful duty, in rendering a public testimony to the virtue and heroism of these Christian Virgins, whose lives shed the good odor of Christ in every place, and whose devotedness and self-sacrifice have, perhaps more than any other cause, contributed to effect a favorable change in the minds of thousands estranged from the Faith."

If ever the truest spirit of patriotic love of America and that great social force of Catholicism- love for one's neighbor--met to part no more in the history of our country, it was when Catholic nuns walked among the dead and dying of our bat-

tlefields. One who watched them the moring after quiet feel upon the terrible scenes at Gettyburg said of them: "After great difficulty they arrived. Never did human eyes behold such a spectacle! Soldiers slain or half dead lay before them graaning in ghastly heaps, some calling for aid and others grapsing alongside hundreds of breathless steeds whose nostrils no longer scented the grimy smoke of battle. Here among these ruins of life thousands of guns, side arms, wheels, projectiles, and all sorts of military accoutrements were promiscuously scattered. Into the midst of these grim ravages of war went these noble messengers of peace and charity, with hardly an inch of ground to step on, and helped to pick up the wounded and carry them to attending farm wagons which had been requisitioned as ambulances. From the labor of assisting on the battleifield, the Sisters proceeded to the town of Gettysburg, which had by this time become a hive of improvised hospitals."

Lincoln's Tribute to Nuns of Battlefields.

Many similar tributes might be recorded in memory of all that the Sisterhoods accomplished by their beautiful lives and character during this greatest of all our political crises. There is one that every Catholic should know by heart, for it comes from the heart of our most beloved American, Abraham Lincoln: "Of all the forms of charity and benevolence seen in the crowded wards of the hospitals, those of some Catholic Sisters were among the most efficient. I never knew whence they came or what was the name of their order. More lovely than anything I have ever seenin art, so long devoted to illustrations of love, mercy, and charity, are the pictures that remain of those modest Sisters going on their errands of mercy among the suffering and dying. Gentle and womanly, yet with the courage of soldiers leading a forlorn hope, to sustain them in contact with such horrors. As they went from cot to cot, distributing the medicines prescribed, or administering the cooling, strengthening draughts as directed, they were veritable angels of mercy. Their words were suited to every sufferer. One they incited and encouraged, another they calmed and soothed. With every soldier they conversed about his home, his wife, his children, all the loved ones he was soon to see again if he was obedient and patient. How many times have I seen them exorcise pain by their presence or their words! How often has the hot forehead of the soldier grown cool as one of these Sisters bathed it! How often has he been refreshed, encouraged, and assisted along the road to convalescence, when he would otherwise have fallen by the way, by the home memories with which these unpaid nurses filled his heart!"

We who are the heirs of the legacy of devotion she created, need no other proof ot the intimat e relationship that is always existent between the Catholic Church and the American Republic. We need no other proof for the statement made a century ago by the eminent French scholar DeTocqueville, who wrote: "The Catholics of the United States are the same time the most faithful believers in God and the most zealous citizens of the Republic."

Article XXVll--Charles O'Conor:
1st Catholic Presidential Candidate--1872

(Our Sunday Visitor, July 8, 1928)

The ten years following the Civil War were even more perilous to the nation's welfare than the conflict itself. Emerging from the greatest military struggle the modern world had seen, the United States was at the threshold of a reconstruction period which demanded the energies and talents of her best statesmen and the hearty co-operation of all on both sides of the Mason and Dixon dividing line. The South was placed under martial rule, and slowly out of the estrangement and the bitterness caused by the war the eleven states of the old Confederacy struggled through unspeakable conditions back to normalcy. In the North, reconstruction was also necessary, but it was mainly financial and industrial, owing to the turning back of nearly a million soldiers to civilian life. The presidential election of 1868 centered around General Grant, the successful Republican candidate, and Horatio Seymour, who led the Democrats to defeat.

So far as the Catholic Church was concerned, these twn years (1865-1875) were aperiod of comparative quiet. The Northern dioceses, led by Archbishop Spalding, appealed to their priests and people for money to aid the stricken Southland, and to impar tial historians of the united States--let us admit that in this respect it is hard to find one--there can be no more unique spectacle during the year after the war than the sight of seven archbishops and thirty-seven bishops of the Catholic Church from every part of the reunited Republic meeting at Baltimore in the Second Plenary Council (October, 1866) for the reconstruction of diocesan life and the revivifying of the Catholic piety and discipline.

The One Tangible Unity.

Contemporary statesmen and political leaders looked on with amazement at this one tangible unity left after the war's wreckage. "The country had just come forth from a most terrible crisis in which many ancient landmakrs had been effaced," we read in the "Life of Archbishop Spalding," and "the very ship of state had been wrenched from its moorings. House had

Article XXVI -- Parish Organizations:

Each Catholic Parish Mutual Benefit Society--1879

(Our Sunday Visitor, May 4, 1929)

been divided against house, brother's hand had been raised against brother. The sects had been torn asunder and still lay in disorder and confusion, helping to widen the abyss which had threatened to engulf the nation's life. Half the country was waste and desolate; the people crushed, bowed beneath their double weight of the momeory of the past, which could no more return, and of the thought of a future which seemed hopeless. On the other side, there were the weariness and exhaustion which follow a supreme effort and the longing for peace and happiness after so much bloodshed and misery. All were ready to applaud any power that had been able to live through that frightful struggle unhurt and unharmed; and when the Catholic Church walked forth before the eyes of the nation clothed in the panoply of undiminished strength and of unbroken amity, thousands, who but a while ago would have witnessed this manifestation of her power with jealous concern, now hailed it with delight as a harbinger of good omen."

Midway in the reconstruction period came the presidential election of 1872. The widespread dissatisfaction among the Republicans over the political corruption which was vitiating the Grant administration led to a split in their ranks, and the Liberal Republican party nominated Horace Greeley as its candidate. Later in the year, the Democratic party met in convention at Baltimore and also nominated Greeley as its condidate. This alliance met with considerable opposition in Democratic ranks, and at a convention held in Louisville, Ky., in September, 1872, these so-called "Straight-Out" Democrats nominated the greatest legal light in the United States, Charles O'Conor, of New York City, as their candidate for President, and John Quincy Adams, the grandson of President John Quincy Adams, as Vice-president.

Charles O'Conor was in his sixty-eighth year at this time. His father, Thomas O'Conor, was one of the Irish rebels of '98, and came to the United States in 1801. Soon after his arrival he became associated with William Kernan in the foundation of a colony in what is now Steuben Co., N. Y. Early in 1803, he married the daughter of Hugh O'Connor, and on January 22, 1804, Charles, his eldest son, was born in New York City. When his colonization scheme failed, Thomas O'Conor returned to New York, and in 1812, began a newspaper called "War," which lasted but ten issues. He then entered into partnership with Stephen Wall as editor of the "Military Monitor and American Register." In April, 1813, he severed his connection with this newspaper and spent a year writing his "History of the Revolutionary War in America," a small-sized volume of three hundred pages.

The leading Irish-American newspaper of New York from 1810 to 1813 was the "Shamrock or Hibernian Chronicle," and was edited by Edward Gillespy. Reviving it in June, 1814, as the "Shamrock," Gillespy secured Thomas O'Conor's services as co-editor. In January, 1815, O'Conor became sole proprietor of the paper. In 1816, the "Shamrock" was the organ of those Irish exiles who thoroughly revenged themselves by defeating Rufus King for the governorship of New York, thus heading him effectively from the presidency of the nation.

Charles O'Conor's Rise to Eminence.

During these years, when his father was prominent in politics, young Charles O'Conor laid the foundation of his future greatness by beginning the study of law. From the age of eleven until a few months after his twentieth birthday, when he was admitted to the New York bar, Charles O'Conor made use of every opportunity the city afforded to equip himself for his chosen profession. From the outset his practice was successful, and that success came, as Thomas F. Meehan has recently said, "from dogged persistent work, joined to great mental ability, the wide extent of which may be judged from the collection of cases and opinions, making more than one hundred volumes, that can be found in the library of the Law Institute of New York."

In 1843, his reputation for legal ability was enhanced by his brilliant defence of the invalidity of the Lispenard will. "The case," O'Conor writes, "excited intense interest, the parties being connect with many of themost wealthy and ancient families of our island. A vast concourse attended. I conducted all the examinations, made the most lengthy and praised speech, and carried off so many honors of every description that I expect nothing less than to be married 'nolens volens' to some of my fair admirers, shot by some of the defendant's witnesses, or visited by some other awful calamity.. From this moment my reputation was fixed. I was intensely, extensively and most inconveniently courted." O'Conor took part in the New York State Constitutional Convention in 1846. In 1848, he was the Democratic candidate for the office of Lieutenant-Governor of New York and was defeated. Four years later he was one of the electors in the successful Democratic election of 1852 which gave the presidency to Franklin Pierce. He accepted unwillingly from Pierce the office of United States District Attorney for the southern district of New York. In 1868, he was hailed in the Democratic newspapers as a logical candidate for the presidency of the United States, but he made it quite clear that, even were the nomination tendered to him unanimously, he would not accept. "My reasons," he wrote at the time, "are of no public importance, and consequently, they need not be stated."

O'Conor's Defense of Jefferson Davis.

O'Conor's reputation was now of national proportions, since he had in 1867 successfully defended Jefferson Davis at Richmond against coming to trial on the charge of treason. O'Conor shares with Horace Greeley the honor of signing the bail bond for the Confederate President. In the autumn of 1871 Charles O'Conor joined Evarts, Peckham, and Samuel J. Tilden, as State counsel for the prosecution of the notorious Tweed Ring. Efforts were made to remove him from the case since it involved(him from the case)some Catholic Politicians of the city, but O'Conor's integrity was so well known that he was retained. There is no doubt that the destruction of the Ring was mainly due to his legal ability.

His nomination for the Presidency of the United States in September, 1872, by the Democratic party was a recognition of his great prominence in the legal and political affairs of the nation. When he was notified by telegraph of the honor, he immediately declined, stating that he did not choose to run for this highest office in the gift of the people. The Louisville convention then nominated James Lyon of Virginia; he also declined. The delegates decided upon the former ticket of O'Conor and Adams, and in the campaign of 1872, the chief opponents to Grant were O'Conor and Greeley. Grant won the election with a majority of 700,000. Greeley carried seven states, and Charles O'Conor received 30,000 votes from twenty-three states.

O'Conor's View of Convention System.

The religious issue was not raised in the campaign of 1872, although no doubt could be cast upon the sterling loyalty of Charles O'Conor to the Catholic Faith. Nor did O'Conor decline the nomination because he feared that such an issue might be injected into pre-election activities. He did not believe that the Louisville seccessionists would succeed in arousing sufficient influence to conquer those of the Democratic party who had agreed to the alliance with the Liberal Republicans. As he viewed the political situation, the Baltimore convention exhibited in their climax "the vices of the nomination system, with its pledges and platforms. Shocking to honest pride and sound morals is the career of bargaining which is now generally required to precede such nominations. The platform is a thing gotten up for the emergency. On it the candidate is made to sit as on a stool of repentenace, or as one placed in the stocks by way of holding him to pledges now forced upon him..

Jefferson Davis.

O'Connor's reputation was now of national proporti
he had in 1 67 successfully defended Jefferson Davi
ebound against counting to trial on the charge of treason.
O'Connor shares with Jefferson Davis the honor of signing the
bail bond for the Confederate President. In the autumn of 1871
Charles O'Connor joined [illegible] and Samuel J. Tilden,
as State counsel for the prosecution of the notorious Tweed
Ring. Efforts were made to remove him from the case since it
involved (in from the beginning Catholic politicians of the
city, but O'Connor's integrity was so well known that he was
re ned. There is no doubt that the destruction of the Ring
materially due to his legal ability.

His nomination for the Presidency of the United States
in September, by the Democratic Party was a recognition
of his great prominence in the legal and political affairs of
the nation. When he was notified by telegraph of the honor
he immediately declined, stating that he did not choose to
for this highest office in the gift of the people. The
Louisville convention that nominated Davis Tilden of Virginia
he also declined. The delegates decided upon the former three
of O'Conor and in the campaign of 1872 the latter
opponents to Grant were O'Conor and Greeley. won the
tion with a majority of 700,000. Greeley carried seven-
and Charles O'Conor [illegible] 80 votes from twenty-
three [illegible]

[illegible] of Donyen for Pyote

The religious issue was not raised in the campaign of
though no doubt could be cast upon the standing Catho-
Charles to the Catholic . Nor did
olize the nomination because he [illegible] upon an issue
ght be injected into pre-election activities. He did not be-
ve that the Louisville accusations would succeed in ex cu-
ng sufficient influence to conquer those of the Democratic
party who [illegible] to the alliance with the liberal Republi-
cans. As he viewed the political situation, the Baltimore con-
tion exhibited in their alliance "the vices of the nominating
ems, with its pledges and platforms. Speaking to Bonaparte
de and sound morals to the agency of [illegible] in now
erally requires to precede such nominations. The platform
up for the emergency. On it the candidate is
a stool of re [illegible] as one issued in
of holding his [illegible] proved use

Whatever I might do in respect to any other office, I could neither accept anomination nor become a candidate for the successorship to Washington."

Grant Reopens Religious Issue.

Grant's second term (1873-1877) was ushered in with a panic and ended with one of the worst industrial crises the nation has seen. In the midst of his second term, Grant was responsible for reopeneing the much-abused religious issue. In a speech delivered before the Army of the Tennessee on September 29, 1875, at Des Moines, the President, no doubt acting under party orders, declared himself ready, if re-elected, to propose to Congress certain measures which in retrospect are startlingly similar to those of Bismark and the Kulturkampf which began about this time. "It was a deliverance," one American bishop wrote at the time, "disgraceful in the chief magistrate of a great nation, and especially so in one who ought to be animated by the high impulses of a soldier, and of a soldier of the United States Army. But it derives great importance from the fact that it has been deemed quite sufficient not only to restore the lost popularity of its author, but to retrieve the fortunes of a falling (Republican) party."

Catholics all over the land expected a revival of the persecution of Know-Nothing days. It is significant that the first number (January, 1876) of the "American Catholic Quarterly Review" openly confessed that a fresh attack upon the liberty enshrined in the Constitution was to be made, if Grant and the Republicans had their way, and that Catholics were the only ones to suffer by this proposed invasions of our constitutional rights. General Grant was dallying with the temptation to tryfor a third term at the time, and the record of his eight years in the presidency was so bespattered by the corruption of those about him, in and out of his cabinet, that the Democratic party, largely backed by Catholic voters, saw a golden chance to win the election of 1876.

The decennial madness with its war cry of "No Popery" was again aroused in the land.

Tilden's Tribute to O'Conor.

In 1877, Charles O'Conor was appointed one of the counsel for the Democratic party in the famous Hayes and Tilden

contest for the presidential election of 1876. On the Electoral Commission was Senator Frank Kernan of New York, the son of William Kernan, with whom Charles O'Conor's father had been engaged in the Steuben County colonization scheme seventy years before. Charles O'Conor's last years were spent at Nantucket, Mass. He died there on May 12, 1884. Samuel J. Tilden, who lost the presidency in 1877, calls Charles O'Conor, in one of his letters, "the greatest jurist among all the English-speaking race;" and Meehan writes: "Catholics, therefore, have no reason to be ashamed of the first citizen of their Faith to be voted for as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States."

Article XXVIII-Orestes A. Brownson
(1803-1876)

(Our Sunday Visitor, July 15, 1928)

Dr. Brownson's son divided the great American philosopher's biography into three parts--early, middle, and later years. It is his later years (1856-1876) which interest us most at this stage of our study of the Catholic Question in the United States.

Orestes A. Brownson was born in 1803 of strict Congregationalists parents, but before his early youth was over, he had joined the Presbyterian church, quitting its membership in 1824, at the age of twenty to become a Universalist. In June, 1826, he was ordained a minister of that denomination, but within three years, he had lost all hold on Christian belief, and for the next ten years he was an acknowledged leader among American free thinkers. In 1832 he accepted the pastorship of a Unitarian church in New Hampshire, leaving it two years afterwards to return to the faith of his parents. In 1828 he founded the "Boston Quarterly Review," a literary and philosophical journal which soon attracted nation-wide attention on account of the radicalness of its views and especially because of its attack upon Democracy as a system of government.

It is said that Van Buren blamed Brownson's article in the "Review" for July, 1840, on the Christian basis of the rights of property and on the necessity of abolishing all forms of Christianity, as a cause of his defeat for reelection. Meanwhile Brownson's extreme views were driving him nearer and nearer to the necessity of accepting some definite form of belief, and in October 1844, after some time spent in study, he was received into the Catholic Church by Bishop John Bernard Fitzpatrick, of Boston.

Many Eminent Converts.

The Oxford Movement was then at the height of its success in England--Newman was received into the Church on October 9, 1845, and the Church of England "reeled under the shock." The years of 1844-1860 have often been spoken of as the Oxford

Movement in America, but the conversions here during that period had causes different from those in England. Many eminent men entered the Faith during these years--Bishop Wadhams of Ogdensburg, Bishop Curtis of Wilmington, Dr. Levi S. Ives, Episcopal Bishop of North Carolina, Father Walworth, Monsignor Preston, Rev. Donald McLeod, James A. MacMaster, Editor of the "Freeman's Journal," and that historic group, Fathers Deshon, Hewit, Baker and Lyman, who later founded the Paulist Congregation. But in all these cases the influences making for conversion were individual.

Of all the converts of these years, Orestes Brownson was beyond doubt the greatest figure in a galaxy of the ablest defenders the Church has had in the United States. In January, 1844, he launched the "Brownson Quarterly Review," and after his conversion that same year, this magazine became the foremost Catholic periodical in the land. Brownson was a genius of the highest type. As a theologian, philosopher, litteratuer, and historian he had few equals in the Church. His profound grasp on the American character and mind made him a formidable foe of Puritan intolerance, ignorance, and prejudice on this side of the Atlantic. For the next twenty-two years, until his death in 1876, he was our leading Catholic apologist, and no other layman, with the sole exception of Dr. James J. Walsh, has approached him in intellectual power and versatility.

Brownson's Great Gifts.

Great praise has been bestowed upon Brownson since his death. He has been called the "intellectual giant of his era," "Our most forceful writer of prose," and one who "has probably left a larger body of work than any other Catholic American." His conversion in 1844 had been styled "an epoch in the history of the Catholic Church in this country, just as that of Newman, which took place a year later, is a milestone in the history of English Catholicism. Of all the distinguished converts to Rome in this country, Brownson is easily the first. In him the submerged Catholics found a champion who in intellectual power was the superior of any publicist in the land." Even a higher encomium might be cited--"he seems to share the energy of a Tertullian, the power of a Cyprian, the polemic ability of an Athanasius, and the eloquence of a Chrysostom."

Such is the man and the scholar upon whom many eyes were fixed during those anxious days before and during the Civil War. Brownson was American's foremost Catholic Abolitionist, and, as we have seen, his appeal for the immediate emancipation of the slaves in 1861 brought down upon his head the anathemas of

Archbishop Hughes. Probably, in no aspect of his twenty volumes of published writings, does he stand forth so clearly as the champion of America's great future than in that dealing with our national ideals. Scattered throughout his works lie the gems of might sermons on the democracy for which the United States stands four-squared to the world. And yet, he was never deceived by the spacious republicanism of some of the statesmen contemporary to himself. Unless the nation, he writes, is made to feel that there is a higher power than itself, and that is may lawfully do nothing in violation of God's commands, it will not last. Boldly he told the intellectual world of his day that the only hope for the American Republic lay in the spread of Catholic principles. "We render solid and imperishable our free institutions," he wrote, "just in proportion as we extend the kingdom of God among our people and establish in their hearts the riegn of justice and charity. And here is our answer to those who tell us Catholicity is incompatible with free institutions. We tell them that they cannot maintain free institutions without it." To those who followed the leading principle of the Nativists or the Know-nothings--that the triumph of the Catholic Church in the United States would mean the subversion of our political and civil Constitution--he said that the conversion of this country to the True Faith "would destroy, would change nothing in this admirable body, but would quicken it with the breath of the Almighty and secure its continuance and its beneficient and successful operation."

Our Democracy Needs Strong Defense

Americans then, as now, were not favorable to anyone who reminded them that our republican institutions were in their final analysis a political experiment, and it was amazing to Brownson how feebly the American public grasped the significant fact that the American Constitution was beyond all others ever written the one formula of government which imposed a powerful restraint upon the dangers inherent in democracy. This Brownson taught without equivocation, and for it was gravely misunderstood in his own day. It took the disillusionment which followed fast on the heels of the Peace of Versailles after the World War to bring the truth home to all of us. Only when scholars of unblemished patriotism, such as Edward P. Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania, gave utterance to thoughts identical to those of Brownson in the last century, do we realize the constant peril a democratic form of government runs when religion is undermined by the periodic bursts of hatred which, although directed solely against the Catholic Church, cannot fail to lessen the religious basis of our national life. In a

volume published recently Dr. Cheyney writes:

"That democracy is the best form of government is not a self-evident proposition. A form of government in which the learned and the ignorant, the thrifty and the unthrifty, the experienced and the inexperienced, may all, so far as their votes go, exercise the same influence over the course of political events seems to need especially strong defense."

What Brownson did for his generation was to emphasize with hammer-blows the all-pervading necessity of religion--and by religion he meant the principles of doctrine as taught and practised by the Catholic Church --for the perdurance of the American Republic. During the period of Nativism (1840-1861), he kept a course so straight in its principles that it is only now, a half-century after his death, that we are beginning to understand how logically he thought and wrote in defence of American freedom at the time when popular passions amongst Catholics and non-Catholics were clouding the issue created by the anti-Catholic movement of the day. In fact, for some years, while the movement was strongest, Dr. Brownson seems to have lost the confidence of Catholic leaders because his analysis of the Nativist principles seemed to be too highly tinged with his own untrammelled Americanism. From the outset, he had, as a true American, no sympathy with Native-Americanism; but where he won hostility in Catholic circles was in his appeal to those who were being defamed by the Nativists, the Irish Catholics, to forget the wrongs of Ireland in order to give of their best to the land of their Adoption. Brownson believed that some of the newspapers of the day being edited by Irish Catholics manifested an unnecessary forgetfulness of the fact that they were writing for American citizens and showed occasionally "an offenseive want of respect for American feelings."

Attacks on Brownson.

The "Catholic Herlad" of Philadelphia, and the "Freeman's Journal" of New York, both edited by converts to the Church, were the leaders in attacking Brownson for this distinction which they considered invidious to the Irish race. There came to him at this time one of the most encouraging letters he ever received, written May 13, 1849, and signed by all the prelates who were then in attendance at the Sixth Provin-

cial Council of Baltimore, commending his superb defence of Catholic doctrines in the "Review" and urging him to continue his work for the Faith. Six years later when the Know-nothing movement was in full swing, Brownson again met with rebukes from fellow-Catholic editors, as well as from leading clerics, because he stressed a distinction between two groups in that party--those who held a proper patriotic native American feeling and those who were anti-Catholic in their patriotism. The article in question had been passed with approval of a priest chosen by Bishop Fitzpatrick of Boston, but this fact did not clear Brownson in the eyes of those who were fighting the Know-Nothingism of the day. What Brownson was fighting for, was to prevent with all the ardor of his pen the effort being made by the Know-Nothings to make the Church in the United States an Irish Church and the American Catholic of Irish nationality.

Became an Abolitionist.

Know-Nothingism was stifled in the presidential election of 1856, and Brownson now threw himself into the question of Abolition. He recognized Chief Justice Taney's decision in the Dred Scott case the following year as the first act of the Southern Rebellion, and his "Review" became an ardent partison of anti-slavery agitation. From 1856 to 1872, Brownson discontinued the "Review," devoting himself during these years to literary works, the chief of which is his "American Republic" and some noteworthy contributions to the "Catholic World," which was founded by the Paulists in 1865. In 1873, Brownson revived the "Review" and it met with immediate success, but two years later, he was obliged to discontinue it on account of his precarious state of health. His last published literary work, "The Philosophy of the Supernatural" appeared in the first number of the "American Quarterly Reviews" for January, 1876, in company with another by his intimate friend and neighbor, "The Catholic Church in the United States," by John Gilmary Shea.

Recently, there has been an effort made in the Catholic press to revive a national Catholic interest in Brownson's writings. There are, indeed, many things in his published "Works" which need correction; but in so far as the Catholic question in the United States is concerned, that is, in the problem of understand the harmony that exists between Catholic ideals of life and our republican institutions, there exists no better source-book than the twenty volumes which have been published by his son.

His Reply to Archbishop Hughes.

Brownson once wrote in reply to an attack made upon him by Archbishop Hughes; "We speak not for others: but, speaking for ourselves, we assure the Archbishop that we have never contended that the principles of our religion may, by a skillful architect, be detailed into our civil and politcal principles, or that the doctrines of the Catholic Church can and should be Americanized.....We have never represented the principles of Catholicity as peculiarly adapted to those of our civil and political institutions, but we have labored to prove that there is no necessary mutual repugnance between them and therefore have concluded, on the one hand, that we may be good Catholics and loyal Americans, and on the other, that we may be loyal Americans and good Catholics."

Article XXlX--"The Faith of Our Fathers"
(1876)

(Our Sunday Visitor, July 22, 1928)

When the future historian of the Catholic Church in the United States comes to write the general history of Catholic literature in this country, he will undoubtedly make the centennial year of 1876 the great dividing line of his subject. Such a complete sketch has not yet been undertaken, if one excepts an article by John Gilmary Shea in the "Metropolitan" of Baltimore in 1854, the short account in John O'Kane Murray's "Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States," which was published for the hundredth anniversary of American Independence in 1876, and the carefully written chapter "Catholic Contributions to American Prose" by Rev. James J. Daly, S. J., in the "Catholic Builders of the Nation." Father Daly well says that "there is room for a handbook of Catholic American literature."

The first century of Catholic American life (1776-1876(witnessed the publication of a very large number of Catholic books in this country on all important topics and in every part of the literary field. Many names might be cited of outstanding figures whose work still lives as an inspiration to this and succeeding generations.

Card. Gibbons' Great Book

The end of that first century saw the publication of the most remarkable book ever penned by an American Catholic--the "Faith of Our Fathers," by the late Cardinal Gibbons, the preface of which is dated Rich mond, November 21, 1876, to which See had had been appointed in 1872.

No writer of our times acknowledged more readily his debt to those who had gone before him than James Gibbons. Back through the hundred years preceding the publication of this popular presentation of Catholic truth were many who had prepared the way for the hearty acceptance of such a book among thousands outside the Church seeking a more intimate knowledge of its doctrines.

Not to wander afield beyond the members of the American Episcopate, to Archbishop Carroll, the Father of the American Church, is due the honor of having written the first Apologetic written by a Catholic and published here--his "Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States," issued at Annapolis in 1794. His successor in the work of making our doctrines known to those outside the Church was Bishop John England of Charleston, whose published writings were reprinted in seven volumes in 1908, by Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee.

The works of Bishop David of Bardstown (181901841)--the "Catechism of Christian Doctrine" (1825), "Vindication of Catholic Doctrine" (1827), "Spiritual Retreat" (1829), and other contributions, merit a place in the annals of the literary achievements of our bishops.

The most promienent Catholic writer of the middle years of the century is Archbishop Francis P. Kenrick, who occupied the See of Philadelphia and later that of Baltimore (1830-1863). Kenrick's Latin works in moral and dogmatic theology appeared during his years in Philadelphia and won the admiration of scholars here and abroad. Other volumes, "Commentary on the Book of Job," "The Primacy of Peter," and a translation of the New Testament, appeared from his pen and amazed all who knew how slight was the leisure at the disposal of an American bishop at the time.

Contemporary with Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore was the illustrious prelate of New York, Archbishop Hughes, whose "Works" were published in two volumes in New York, in 1865. Among the many writings of Kenrick's successor, Archbishop Martin John Spalding, are "Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky," "The History of the Protestant Reformation," and a popular collection of essays and lectures, entitled "Miscellanea."

Archbishop Bayley, who succeeded to the See of Baltimore on the death of Spalding, in 1872, is best known for some excellent historical works, "History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York" and "Memoirs of Bishop Brute," which are exceptional volumes because based upon original sources.

Bishop McGill, who died at Richmond in 1872, published two brilliant apologies for Catholic doctrine, unfortunately forgotten now with the lapse of time,--"The True Church" and

"Our Faith, the Victory." There is a resemblance between these two books and the "Faith of Our Fathers" which Cardinal Gibbons, then Bishop of Richmond and the successor of Bishop McGill, published in 1877.

Aimed to Dispel Prejudice.

In the preface to his first edition, Bishop Gibbons said: "The object of this little volume is to present, in a plain and practical form, an exposition and a vindication of the principal tenets of the Catholic Church." In one sense this little volume of four hundred pages is a complete Catholic theology. It opens with an Introduction which says: "My dear Reader--Perhaps this is the first time in your life that you have handled a work in which the doctrines of the Catholic Church are expounded by one of her own sons. You havve no doubt, heard and read many things regarding our Church; but has not your information come from teachers justly liable to suspicion?-----Hence, without intending to be unjust, is not your mind biased against us because you have listened to flase witnesses?-----The Catholic Church is persistently misrepresented by the most powerful vehicles of information--In a large portion of the press, and especially in the pulpit which should be consecrated to truth and charity, she is the victim of the foulest slanders."

Bishop Gibbons quite frankly states that had he been educated as the majority of Protestants were, he would perhaps be "breathing vengeance against her today, instead of consecrating my life to her defence." He asks his readers, therefore, to give to his exposition of Catholic Truth a fair measure of their unprejudiced attention.

Over Million Copies Sold.

There is no need to describe the contents of this marvellous little apologetical volume. Before twenty-five years had passed, over a million and a quarter copies of the "FAith of Our Fathers" were sold, and it is fair to assume that the larger proportion of the buying public was ot the Protestant and Jewish faiths. Editions were soon published in all foreign languages and the name of James Gibbons was spread far and wide over the world as one of the greatest defenders of the Faith in modern times.

Naturally, the chapter most non-Catholic turned to at once on securing the book, was that entitled "Civil and Religious Liberty." It may be of value to remark here that a comparison of the first edition in 1877 and the last edition of recent years shows no change, even of a comma, of this remarkable exposition of the spiritual and civil allegiance of Catholics.

We needed guidance in the '70's. The promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility in 1870, while the most blessed boon in modern times to the Catholic mind and heart, had caused so much misunderstanding, not to speak of schism and heresy within the Church itself, that any clear and well-defined exposition of the dual allegiance every Catholic holds towards the Spouse of Christ and to his own native land, came as a staff of steadfastness. This exposition James Gibbons gave, as no Catholic prelate in the United States before or since has given, to many of the faithful who needed a perfect formula for their obedience attitude towards the Holy See.

It was a noble, and a courageous thing to say--not many months after the President of the United States had declared otherwise--that "the Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty and that, whenever any encroachments on these sacred rights of man were perpetrated by professing members of the Catholic faith, these wrongs, far from being sactioned by the Church, were committed in palpable violation of her authority." Little wonder, then, that Archbishop Glennon, in his funeral oration over the great Cardinal, called the "Faith of Our Fathers"--our best "apologia" in the English language, "the best when written fiffty years ago, the best now, and we have reason to believe that even later history will not record a better."

This first work from Gibbons' penwas to remain all through the fifty years of his leadership of the Church in the United States his greatest book. No historian of our Church can venture to neglect its place in the hidden springs of Catholic life and in the thousands of conversions to the Church since 1877. Never before, in so clear, and if the word is proper, in so American a way, was the truth of the Catholic Faith placed before the people of this country with so much sincerity and clamness.

The Cardinal's Arguments

The argument the great Cardinal handled in this chapter was a current problem of the day--"Many Protestants seem to be

very much distrubed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience, because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power they will destroy this freedom because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is then a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage."

This was a statement of the case in a language all could understand; and in answering it, there was a simplicity of style and a serenity of treatment which made the "Faith of Our Fathers" acceptable to all. No controversial treatise had been written up to that time in so broad and sympathetic a spirit. To the question of Catholic loyalty, or to use a much-abused phrase "double-allegiance," Bishop Gibbons replied from an entirely new viewpoint--"The Catholics of our generation have nobly emulated the patriotism and the spirit of toleration exhibited by their ancestors. They can neither be accused of disloyalty nor of intolerance to their dissenting brethren. In more than one instance of our nation's history our churches have been desecrated and burned to the ground, our convents have been invaded and destroyed; our clergy have been exposed to insult and violence. These injuries have been inflected on us by incendiary mobs animated by hatred of Catholicism. Yet, in spite of these provocations, our Catholic citizens, though wielding an immense numberical influence in the localities where they suffered, have never retaliated. It is in a spirit of just pride that we can affirm that hitherto in the United States no Protestant house of worship or educational institution has been destroyed, nor violence offered to a Protestant minister by those who profess the Catholic faith. God grant that such may always be our record!"

His Love for His Country.

After describing the persecution the Church was suffering in various parts of Europe, he contrasts with scenes of violence and injustice across the Atlantic the peace, security of the Catholic Faith under the American Flag. It is in these pages that the future Cardinal stated clearly and boldly for the first time his preference for the policy of a separation of Church and State. "Thank God," he writes, "we live in a country where liberty of conscience is respected, and where the civil institution holds over us the aegis of her protection, without intermeddling

with ecclesiastical affairs. From my heart, I say: America, with all her faults, I love thee still! Perhaps, at this moment there is no nation on the face of the earth where the Church is less trammelled, and where she has more liberty to carry out her sublime destiny than in these United States. For my part, I much prefer the system which prevails in this country where the temporal needs of the Church are supplied by voluntary contributions of the faithful, to the system which obtains in some Catholic countries of Europe, where the Church is supported by the government."

The "Faith of Our Fathers" brought into American Catholic apologetics a new note and a new method. Cardinal Gibbons' biographer has not exaggerated its value when he styles the volume "the most successful of all the formal statements of Catholic truth since the days of Canisius and the Council of Trent." From the date of its publication--the opening year of America's second centenary as an independent nation, James Gibbons became known to non-Catholics throughout the country as the ideal Catholic American, and the basis for his great prestige was undoubtedly the good-will and affection the "Faith of Our Fathers" was winning for him in non-Catholic circles. "It was less a book than a wonderful religious even," writes his biographer in 1921, "and its literary career, the story of its countless conversions, has never halted in the forty-five years that it has held the public confidence. Neither before nor since had the Catholic religion been placed before the American people with so much truth and simplicity. Almost artless in style, stripped of every unnecessary consideration, it could never have been written by any other than James Gibbons, then a poor Catholic missionary bishop, lost, almost submerged, in a non-Catholic society, whose hostility he knew by long experience to be the result mainly of ignorance, but whose good qualities of mind and heart he recognized and loved...After the Bible, perhaps no religious book had or has so wide a circulation, in the original and in many translations."

The history of the Catholic Question in the United States reached a grand dividing line in the publication of the "Faith of Our Fathers" in 1877. Not only did this marvellous little book clear away the prejudices of thousands outside the Church but it gave to Catholic defenders of the Faith new light and new zeal for the century opening before them.

Article XXX--The Paulists.

(Our Sunday Visitor, July 29, 1928)

In the year 1858, the Church in the United States consisted of seven provinces, divided into forty-seven dioceses and vicariates. Our Archbishops at that time were: John Hughes (New York), Francis Patrick Kenrick, (Baltimore), John Baptist Purcell (Cincinnati), Peter Richard Kenrick (St. Louis), Anthony Blanc (New Orleans), Joseph Sadoc Alemny (San Francisco), and Francis Norbert Blanchet(Oregon), We had in that year seventeen Catholic weekly newspapers, three monthly magazines, and one quarterly review (Bronwson's), The religious orders at work in the parishes of the country or in our educational institutions were : The Jesuits, Redemptorists, Augustianians, Franciscans, Dominicans, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Vincentians, Benedictines, Passionists, Precious Blood Fathers, Holy Cross Fathers, Premonstratensians, and Sulpicians. Only by a careful and laborious search in the pages of the 1858 "Catholic Directory" would it be possible to ascertain the proportion between the secular and regular clergy in the two thousand priests listed in that little volume.

These religious Orders had many American-born priests in their ranks and all were busil engaged in missionary and educat ional work in every section of the United Stat es. They had adapted themselves to some extent to the particular religious needs of our country; and, while dependent upon superiors in Europe, their progress was in whole-hear ted sympathy with American ideals and customs.

No one had apparently conceived the plan of an American religious community, until Father Hecker and his little group began to organize such a plan. On December 22, 1857, Father Hecker had his first audience with Pius IX and laid before that august Pontiff a project which he proposed in his own name as well as in the that of four of his close friends, who were like himself at the time members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer.

Founder of Paulists

Father Isaac Hecker was then a man of about forty years, having been born in New York City in 1819. In August, 1844, he entered the Catholic Church and was baptized by the future Cardinal McCloskey. The following year he joined the Redemptorists and was sent to their novitiate at St. Trone, in Belgium. He was ordained to the priesthood, on October 23, 1849, by the future Cardinal Wiseman in London, and two years later began his ministry in New York City. With him were two other American converts, Father Hewit and Father Walworth, and later they were joined by Fathers Deshon and Baker. From 1852 to 1857 Father Hecker labored in the parochial work assigned to him in giving missions in various cities of the United States. It was while he was a Redemptorist that he published his "Questions of the Soul" in 1855, and two years later his "Aspirations of Nature." Both volumes were a restatement of Catholic doctrinal principles and were widely read at the time, owing to Father Hecker's participation in the celebrated Brook Farm movement.

In the spring of 1857, the Redemptorists were contemplating the foundation of a new house of the Order either in New York City or in Newark, and the wish was expressed that it should become the headquarters of the American members of the Order. Accordingly, to promote this plan, Father Hecker went to Rome in August, 1857, in order to lay the project before the General of the Order. "This journey," writes Sedgwick, in his biographical sketch of Father Hecker, "Was a turning-point in Hecker's life, and was the cause of founding the Paulist Community." Back of this great decision--one of the most important in the whole history of the Catholic Question in the United States--lies an intensely interesting page of American Catholic history. The result of the action of the Roman Congregations, was that Fathers Hecker, Walworth, Hewit, Deshon, and Baker were dispensed from their vows as Redemptorists and were left free to carry out their hearts' desires--to devote themselves to missionary work among non-Catholics.

Purposes of Paulists

Father Hecker reached New York in May, 1858, and within a short time had founded the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle, familiarly known to us as the Paulists. Foremost among the purposes of the new religious Order thus creat-

ed was the personal sanctitification of its members; but where Father Hecker made a distinction that has since become historic, was in defining that perfection as being influenced by our national characteristics and by the type of civilization in the United States. It would be a mistake not to emphasize all that this meant in a country like ours where at the time of which we are writing, one of the chief quarrels with Catholicism was that it was a foreign religion, administered by foreigners, and where it was alleged unfairly that its adherents, with only a few notable exceptions, had not seemed anxious or willing to identify themselves with the inherent values of American life and customs.

In Father Hecker's diaries we learn the scope of the new plan he had evolved not only for bringing Catholic doctrines to the minds and hearts of his countryment but also for infusing American life and progress with all the benefits of Catholic thought and action. He thoroughly accepted "American civilization with its usages and customs," because he believed that it was "the only way by which Catholicity can become the religion of our people." The character and spirit of our people and their institutions, he wrote, "must find themselves at home in our Church in the way those of other nations have done; and it is on this basis alone that the Catholic religion can make progress in our country."

Father Hecker's Americanism

Father Hecker contributed more in one short paragraph to the solution of the Catholic Question in the United States than all his contemporaries. He described the actual situation of his own day, as Bishop John England had done a score of years before, in the following words: "The form of government of the United States is preferable to Catholics above other forms. It is more favorable than others to the practices of those virtues which are the necessary conditions of the development of the religious life of man. This government leaves man a larger margin for liberty of action, and hence for cooperation with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, than any other government under the sun. With these popular institutions men enjoy greater liberty in working out their true destiny. The Catholic Church will, therefore, flourish all the more in this republican country in proportion as her representatives keep, in their civil life, to the lines of their republicanism." This thesis on the splendid opportunity for Catholicism in the United States had been developed by Father Hecker in two articles which appeared in the Roman periodical "Civilta Cattolica" in 1857, and later in his "Church and the Age" (1867).

The argument in these writings may be given in his own words: "During its three centuries of existence a republican form of government has nowhere under Protestant ascendancy made its appearance.....if Protestants have contributed to human freedom, it was not as Protestants; the motives which prompted them did not spring from their religious creed, for that was a foe to human rights and the grave of liberty....in no place where Protestantism prevailed among a people as their religion, has it given birth to a republic, and nowhere in the nineteenth century does there exist a republic in a Protestant land....Calvinism excludes republicanism inpolitics....that the pages of history testify to the close relationship existing between popular governments and the Catholic faith is shown by the fact that all republics since the Christian era have sprung into existence under the influence of the Catholic Church.....the doctrines of the Catholic Church alone give to popular rights, and governments founded thereupon, an intellectual basis, and furnish their vital principle. What a Catholic believes as a member of the Catholic Church, he believes as a citizen of the republic. His religion consecrates his political convictions."

This was a totally unexpected answer to those who had waged a violent warfare on the Church in the decade before the Civil War and to those who were waiting for normalcy after 1865 to renew the hostilities which had for sixty years injured America's good name abroad for religious equality and tolerance. To tell his generation, as Father Hecker did, that the relationship between Catholicism and our republican ideals was so intimate and vital "that no attack can be made against the Church which is not equally a blow against the republic," was not a welcome political philosophy to the Nativist groups. The discerning mind on the contrary, Father Hecker states, "will not fail to see that the republic and the Catholic Church are working together under the same divine guidance, forming the various races of men and nationalities into a homogeneous people, and by their united action giving a bright promise of a broader and higher development of man than has been heretofore accomplished."

Work of the Paulists

To bring this lesson, and warning, to the hearts of all Americans, the Paulists began their great work through three definite channels--parish work, missions to non-Catholics, and the apostolate of the press. In April, 1865, the first number of the "Catholic World" appeared. In 1866, Father Heck-

er organized the Catholic Publication Society for the distribution of tracts and books on Catholic doctrine, and so vital a want did this Society fill in American Catholic life that the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (October, 1866) ordered branches of the work to be established in all our diocesan centers and to be supported by an annual collection. In their Pastoral Letter, the prelates said: "We earnestly recommend to the faithful of our charge the Catholic Publication Society, lately established in the City of New York by a zealous and devoted clergyman." They urged both the clergy and the laity to cooperate in the undertaking, "which is second to none in importance among the auxiliary aids which the inventions of modern times supply to our ministry for the diffusion of Catholic Truth."

After Father Hecker's death in December, 1888, the work he inaugurated went on unabated in zeal and success. In 1894, the Paulists began the work of training members of the diocesan clergy to carry on locally missions to non-Catholics, and in 1903, they opened the Apostolic Mission House at the Catholic University of America as a normal school for those preists who were selected for these missions.

The Question Box

It would be a valuable page in the history of Catholic progress in this country if we could measure all that the Paulist missions to non-Catholics have accomplished, not only in conversions to the true Faith, but in lessening prejudice, correcting ignorance, and in overcoming the all too-prevalent persistence of the age-old attitude upon the alleged incompatibility of Catholic religious principles and American political ideals. One prominent feature of these missions was the public answering of objections to Catholic truth. A practical result of these missions was the publication by Father Bertrand L. Conway, a member of the Paulists, of ::The Question Box," in 1903. This stout little volume has long since reached the three million mark in copies sold and distributed throughout the United States. Hardly any one point at issue between Catholicism and the sects is missing in its six hundred pages. Here again, we find a new method of approach to the non-Catholic mind--the objections are put in the very words they use when discussing Catholic doctrines, and the answers are incisive, trenchant, brief and adequate.

One question which the Paulists met in practically every

section of the United States was voiced in various terms but all expressing the same difficulty in the Protestant mind-"How can Catholics give this country an undivided allegiance when they are subject to a foreign power, and, if the law of the Pope should conflict with the laws of the United States, which would you obey?"

In a thousand ways that objection has followed the progress of the Church all down the years of American national life. It was useless, as the Paulists missionaries knew by experience, to point to the great galaxy of Catholic names written on the scroll of American heroism. What the Puritan mind needed then as now was a re-statement of a doctrine dearer than life to every Christian, namely, that the State itself automatically lost all authority over man's allegiance once it dared to encroach upon the laws of God or upon conscience. Examples are cited in the "Question Box" from past history to prove that Catholics have never once mistaken the meaning and the extent of their spiritual obedience to the head of their Church.

One of American's greatest missionaries, who wielded a great influence over the young priests who sat at his feet learning the ways and means of bringing a saner and less prejudiced outlook upon Catholic truth into the minds of our non-Catholic Americans, Father Walter Elliott, who died during the year, wrote in his "Non-Catholic Missions," after the experience of a half-century in the work, that the main points of difference he found were Church authority, Papal infallibility, Confession, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence, purgatory, prayers for the dead, the intercession of the saints, and the so-called "double-allegiance" of the Catholics to the Church and the State. And the main point to be made here in this list of difficulties over Catholic principles is that the last of these questions has apparently become less and less a problem to none-Catholic Americans.

That problem lies at the root of the Catholic Question in the United States, and if it has decreased in potency as an objection to Catholicism, the credit must be given in a generous measure to the work of the Paulists during the past seventy years.

Article XXXl--The "Catholic World"
(1865)

(Our Sunday Visitor, August 5, 1928)

Within the past year, one of the best known members of the Society of Jesus in this country wrote: "It is a grave disadvantage for the entire world as well as for ourselves that in the language which is now more widespread and potent than any other there are about five Catholic writers who command attention on any subject outside limited circles of Catholic readers. There are certain things which the world needs, which we alone have, and which can be imparted in no other way, so effectively at least, as through the press."

Sixty-threeyears ago, when Father Isaac Hecker launched the greatest of all his works--"The Catholic World," there were not five Catholic writers in the United States who commanded such attention. In fact, besides Hecker himself, there was probably only one: Orestes A. Brownson.

Foundation of Paulists.

Scarcely any one event in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States seems more surely the action of Dvine Providence than the foundation of the Paulists. They came into existence as a separate congregation in those stirring years immediately before the outbreak of the Civil War when it looked to all, high and low alike in the nation, that the unity created by the Founders of the Federal Constitution was at last to be dissolved. Their community was founded in 1858, during one of those periodic lulls which come from time in the anti-Catholic agitations of our country. But the distinguished converts fromProtestantism who gathered around Hecker--Hewit, Walworth, Baker and Deshon--knew too well, to use Brownson's words, that in such a lull many Catholics seemed to be possessed "with an undefined notion that the people who made the Penal Laws and executed them have become imbued with a milder spirit toward the Church; that know-nothingism was a thing of the past, the virtue of the cry of "No Popery' dissipated, and the fell spirit of the Native-American party utterly extinct."

The members of the new community--America's first gift to the great legacy of religious orders and congregations in the Church--had as the external labor of their rule the conversion of non-Catholics in the United States. Converts there had been in great numbers from later colonial times down to the year of the Paulist foundation, but no concerted and systematized effort to bring the Faith to the minds and hearts of Non-Catholic Americans had been tried before. The task was a very difficult one. Here was a group of priests who had been Protestants going out into the missionary field to preach Catholic doctrine to those outside the Church. Not enough has been made of the fact that their very knowledge of the errors and pitiful inconsistencies of Protestantism led them to see and to appreciate the more highly the blessing of dogmatic Catholic faith.

Catholic teaching in its entirety was sacred to these pioneers who believed that the time had come at last to bring light into the ever-darkening religious fold of Protestantism. They sought nothing novel in carrying out their mission. But they did strike a new note in Catholic apologetics in the country: they were determined to carry into the camp of the enemy--it is difficult to find a kindler word for those who had been attacking the Church so viciously up to that time--to carry into the enemy's camp the lesson that not only could a Catholic be a good American, but that he ought to be among the best Americans in patriotic love for our country because of his Catholicism. Likewise, Father Hecker's preaching brought a pregnant message to Catholics themselves--namely, that the United States, considering the political and economic condition of the world, offered a particularly attractive opportunity for the spread of Catholic truth and for the acceptance of the Catholic Faith.

Creation of the "Catholic World."

It is well to stress these points for the reason that they are the motive force back of the creation of the "Catholic World" in 1865. The claim is made and with justress that nowhere can a stronger, more enlightened, more appreciative defence of Catholic truth, or Catholic interests, and ofCatholic political philosophy be found than in the issues of the "Catholic World." This oldest of our surviving Catholic monthly magazines, indeed it is the third oldest magazine in America, was begun in a spirit of mutual love for God and country; for Church and State. Father Hecker taught no new doctrine nor any new adaptation of that doctrine in this difficult question of the relations between the young State and the ancient Church. But he did realize, as the best minds inthe Church here have al-

ways realized, that in the doctrines and in the moral discipline of the Catholic Faith American aspirations and ideals would find their surest foundation and their only secure support. This was to be the message of the "Catholic World," especially during the years of Hecker's editorship (1865-1868).

Catholic ventures into the realm of monthly magazines of a higher order had not been felicitous before the Civil War. The "Metropolitan or Catholic Monthly Magazine" was founded in Baltimore in 1830 as the result of the deliberations of the first Provincial Council of Baltimore. It lived only one year. In 1842, under the editorship of Rev. Dr. Charles I. White, the "Religious Cabinet" was issued, but the title was changed in the second volume to "The United States Catholic Magazine." This monthly periodical was discontinued for want of support in 1847. In 1853 the "Metropolitan" was revived and was published monthly until 1859. St. Louis had a monthly periodical called "The Catholic Cabinet" for two years (1842-1844); and for six years (1841-1846), two celebrated priests of New York, Dr. Felix Varela and Dr. Chas. Constantine Pise, edited the "Catholic Expositor and Literary Magazine." There were besides two monthly magazines for Catholic children which did not last long, and for a time after 1844, Philadelphia had a "National Catholic Register" which proved unsuccessful. Several other monthly magazines are found mentioned in the advertisements before the Civil War, but the fact seems to be that after the demise of the "Metropolitan" of Baltimore in 1859, we had no Catholic magazine devoted to literature until the "Catholic World" was founded after peace came in 1865. Its purpose, to use Father Walter Elliott's characteristic phrase, "was to speak for religion in high-grade periodical literature."

Pope's Praise of New Magazine.

The "Catholic World" was a success from the start. Three years after it appeared Father Hecker received a letter from Pope Pius IX extolling his zeal in its publication and praising the magazine for its erudition and perspicuity. Cardinal Farley could write onthe cocasion of its goldern jubilee in 1915: "The 'Catholic World' though not the first, is one of the most valiant and most efficient defenders of Holy Church. It was hailed with joy by the Catholics of this city, who prophesied for it a splendid future, which has been more than realized. Such a voice with its tone of no surrender was sorely needed them. The publicists and pamphleteers of that day attacked the Church with a virulence they would not dare to use in speaking of the most insignificant denomination."

The establishment of the "Catholic World" is a line of demarcation in the history of the Catholic Question in the United States. It made our adversaries respect the truth, at a time when "truth was never a weapon they sought to instill in their armory against the Church."

Strangely enough, and yet not at all strange if one keeps in mind the profound humility of Isaac Hecker, the "Catholic World" appeared without any prospectus or announcement explaining its purpose. For some years, Father Hecker was obliged to depend upon his own translations of foreign articles to make up each issue, but from the outset the book reviews and miscellaneous notes were original, and it was not long before these began to have a telling effect upon the prejudices which lasted like rank weeds in a garden reddened with the blood of Catholic and Protestant and Jew during the Civil war. As time went on, the "Catholic World" gave courage to our writers and there came gradually into existence a school of Catholic American letters composed of excellent scholars, scientists and litterateurs. During the first half-century of its existence (1865-1915), the "Catholic World" represented the best there was in American culture, and the six hundred issues which represented that labor of love and of hope, are amine of information for the historian of the inner, unseen development of Catholic life in this country.

Under the editorship of Hecker, Howit, Alexander Doyle, John J. Burke, and James M. Gillis, every prominent Catholic writer in Europe and America found a welcome in the pages of the "Catholic world." A summary of the subjected treated during these fifty years shows that historical articles outnumber all the other departments--doctrinal and apologetic, biographical, literary, fiction, philosophical, sociological, and scientific. This was only natural in our country where, by the time the Civil war has passed, there was little left in the Protestant mode of attack of a doctrinal kind. The old battleground of the middle sixteenth century between the Centuriators of Madgeburg and the school of Baronius was in the historical field, and as Protestantism rapidly lost its doctrinal character owing to the advance of the liberalistic and rationalistic schools in its ranks during the first half of the nineteenth century, its protagonists had little left for their attack upon Catholicism except the false and misleading history which the immediate followers of Luther, Calvin and Knox had deliberately fabricated.

Notable Article Supporting Faith.

Nowhere else in Catholic American literature will the stu-

dent find better guidance for the history of the Catholic Question in the United States than in these articles. In the Centennial Year (1876) three essays on the Question were printed and these taken together form a complete story of the struggle for religious freedom and equality during the first hundred years of our national life. The first of these is entitled "The Catholic Church in the United States, 1776-1876," and contains the clearest retrospect we possess for that jubliee year. The summary it gives of the helps and hindrances to Catholic progress can hardly be bettered. The writer depicts the grave problems which threatned the stability of Catholic life within the Church itself. Outside the Church there were constant threats and dangers also; the possibility of taxation of Church property, the anti-Catholicism of the public schools, the de-christianizing of the American boys and girls through atheistic text-books and agnostic teachers, and the political ostracism practiced upon Catholics, in spite of their outstanding civic merit. Behind all this external opposition, the writer saw the crude Puritanism of colonial times. "Puirtanism," he says, "more than any other form of Protestantism drew its very life from a hatred of all that is Catholic....the Puritans looked upon the Catholic Church as the fatal enemy alike of religion and of freedom; their fanaticism, not less than their enthusiastic love of independence, filled them with the deepest hatred for Catholics."

In spite of this formidable opposition, Catholicism had made a record of progress in our country which can only be paralleled in Apostolic times. Probably in no other country was the Church put to such a test to prove her strength and vitality. With very few exceptions, we read, Catholics had, throughout the whole country, "been rigidly excluded from all the higher political offices; though now, unfortunately, this can hardly be considered a grievance, since the general corruption and unworthiness of public life have caused the more respectable class of American citizens to shrink from the coarseness and vulgarity of our partisan contests. What political reasons may have determined the great body of Catholic voters in this country to prefer the Democratic to the Whig, and later the Republican party, we know not; but we are very sure that nothing could be more unfounded than to imagine that the welfare or progress of the Church can in any way be connected with the success of Democratic partisanism. As a religious body we have nothing to hope from either or any party. We ask but the liberty which with us is considered the inalienable heritage of all Christian believers."

Bigotry's Excesses An Aid to the Church.

The "Catholic World" has never lost sight of the fact that every anti-Catholic movement in our history has been a humiliating confession of Protestant weakness. In one article on the Catholic Question, we are told that "the efforts to arrest the progress of the Church, which now for nearly half a century have assumed a kind of periodicity, may be placed among the causes which have added to her strength. Those attempts re made in open violation of the religious and political principles which are the special boast of all Americans, and the only arguments which can be adduced to justify them are drawn from fear or hatred. Whenever we have been made the victims of lawlessness or fraud, as in the burning of the Charlestown convent and the churches of Philadelphia, or in the spreading of 'Awful Disclosures' throughout the land, the sympathies of generous and honest men have been attracted to us. And when Protestant bigotry has made an alliance with a political party in order to compass our ruin, it has merely succeeded in forcing the oppositing party to take upthroughtou the whole country the defence of the Catholics. Thus during the brief day of the Know-nothing conspiracy large numbers of Protestants, for the first time since the Reformation, were led to examine into the history of the Church, with a view to defend her against the traditional objections of Protestantism itself. In fact, in a country which looks with equally tolerant complacency upon every form of belief or unbelief, to imagine that there can be either decent or reasonable motives for exciting to persecution of the Catholic Church is sheer madness; nor can we think it less absurd to suppose that the good sense and justice of the American people will allow them to commit themselves to a policy as inconsistent as it would be outrageous."

Father Hecker never failed during these long years of his editorship to stress principles which were then obvious to all who seriously contemplated the future of the American Republic:--Protestantism, which had been the religion of the vast majority of Americans, was gradually losing its hold upon their convictions, while the struggle facing the Church in the second century of our national life was not to be with old-time Protestantism but with the skepticism, naturalism, barren humanitarianism, and rationalism to which it had finally descended.

"Unsupported by religious convictions," wrote Father Hecker, "no nation can realize its true destiny. Unity of religious conviction, and the virtuesnecessary to uphold its institutions, are more necessary to a republic like ours than

to any other form of political government. The principles and views of human nature on which our republic is based are sustained by the doctrines of Christianity taught by the Catholic Church."

Other articles in the "Catholic World" deserve to be analyzed for their eminent value in our study of the Catholic Question, but we can only enumerate them. "Catholics in the American Revolution," "Charles Carroll of Carrollton," and "The Next Phase of Catholicity in the United States," which were published in 1876, are among the most precious papers of Catholic historical literature we possess. One other article, however, soars above these in its direct appeal to the sources--"The Rise of Religious Liberty in the United States," which appeared in the issue for September, 1876.

Here is an opportunity for some wealthy Catholic to assist the Church in demonstrating to all outside the Faith that there is nothing in the teachings or practices of our religion that tends to lessen our whole-hearted loyalty to American republican ideals. All these articles should be reprinted in book form and to them should be added John Gilmary Shea's article in the November, 1889, issue of the "Catholic World," entitled "A Century of Catholicity in the United States."

Dr. Brownson's constant message to those of his generation was that the salvation of the American Republic depended upon Catholic doctrines.

Father Hecker's Constant Message.

Father Hecker's constant message in the pages of the "Catholic World" was that, with all courtesy and fairness, and with an entire absence of acrimony, all Catholics had as the highest duty to their citizenship to bring the force of this principle to the hearts of all their fellow-citizens.

The "Catholic World" taught its readers how to present Catholic doctrine intelligently, attractively, and in a pleasing style. Such was the lofty purpose of Father Hecker and his associates.

The great founder of the Paulists stands at the parting of the ways in the history of the Catholic Question in the United States. It is from the advent of the "Catholic World" into American letters that we can trace a fairer, more sympathetic and more comprehending attitude towards Catholicism in our land.

Article XXXII--A Critical Year (1876)

(Our Sunday Visitor, August 12, 1928)

The Centennial Year (1876) of the American nation presents many confusing aspects of a social and political nature which continue to perplex our historians.

The older portrayal of its last decade (1866-1876) as a glorious climax to a century of magnificent success in the art of government is now abandoned. As one of our recent historians, Allan Nevins, has written in his "Emergence of Modern American (1865)1876)," Centennial Year came at the end of one of the most varied and complex periods in the whole history of America. It was, he says, a period of striking contrasts between vice and virtue in practically all walks of life, of contending political aspirations, of new views of life crowding out the old.

Probably the most striking anomaly in the curious paradoxes of this year was the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. The evils ofReconstruction, the wave of disorder and outrage following in the wake of the Ku Klux Klan, the unspeakable scenes in some of the Southern legislatures, the reeking exposures of graft and corruption in national and municipal politics, the moral disgrace which reached the presidential chair itself, the panic of 1873, the scandals of the Tweed Ring and the Credit Nobilier,--these are some of the social factors which made the better classes of our people "painfully aware that in many respects the year of 1876 was an infelicitious time for America to place herself on exhibition." Dr. Nevins, whom we are quoting, avers that it was a year to make American ashamed rather than proud. Indeed, instead of celebrating a great anniversary, it was a year when national humiliation seemed to reach its highest peak.

One salient aspect of American Protestantism at the time, apart from the pitiful moral collaspse of its great leader Henry Ward Beecher--son of that Lyman Beecher whom we now know to be responsible for the outrage upon the Charlestown nuns in 1834--

was the seccession in its churches into sectional religious jurisdictions, thus carrying over to our own day an evil for the cessation of which politically we paid a fearful price during the Civil War. No stronger force was at work for the re-establishment of complete unity in the nation than the Catholic Church. The assembly of our prelates from North, South, East and West in the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 was hailed with gladness by Catholic and non-Catholic as a sign of a better union to come. The Catholic Church had made a steady progress between the First and Second Plenary Councils of Baltimore (1852-1866), and its spiritual growth during the next decade was unprecedented in the annals of Catholicism.

Bigotry of Stanton.

With the sole exception of the swift recrudescence of the anti-Catholic spirit through Secretary Stanton's unbridled bigotry--a history which stand the hands of the government with the blood of a possibly innocent woman--there was visible in the ten years following Appomattox a change in the general attitude of non-Catholics towards the Church. This change was revealed in a more sublte attack upon Catholic liberties.

The century which had passed had proven beyond all shadow of doubt that down in the average American's mind, planted there by centuries of Puritan animosity and fostered by a Protestant press that literally teemed with diatribe and challenge, there was an instinct which told him that the most powerful incentive to religious solidarity within his own ranks was unremitting insolence to the Catholic Church. It was disconcerting, however, to find that violence and outrage had failed to create political cohesion in Protestant circles in the United States. Protestant leaders here began to realize that vulgar and un-American methods of arresting the progress of the Church had only added to her strength, and that whenever members of the Church had become victims of anti-Catholic fraud or lawlessness, the sympathy of thousands of honest, God-fearing members of their own sects was given whole-heartedly to their Catholic fellow-citizens. By 1876 Protestant leaders had recognized the strategy of curbing the religious prejudices of the uneducated masses who had crowded the lodges of the Know-Nothings, and of directing the attack upon Catholic citizens through measures of legislation.

President Grant's Bid to Bigotry.

The prophet of this new hope was President Grant. Towards the close of his second term, some of the leaders of the Repub-

lican party urged him to run for a third term. Grant's immense popularity was considered a justifiable excuse for breaking with the two-term tradition. The corruption which had sullied the honor of the Republican party gave the Democrats a unique chance for victory at the polls under the leadership of the distinguished Governor of New York, Samuel J. Tilden. Largely identified with the democratic party as the successor of the anti-Federalists, Catholic American citizens quickly became the object of vile abuse in the national Congress and in the leading magazines and newspapers. Chief among these were "Harper's Weekly" and the "New York Times."

On September 20, 1876, at Des Moines, before the veterans of the Army of the Tennessee, President Grant practically made a bid for a third term by outlining to that branch of the Grand Army of the Republic (then strongly anti-Catholic in its views) an organized attack upon the Church in this country through amendments to the Federal Constitution. The legislation thus projected by the President was to follow closely the successful outlawing of the Catholic Faith in Germany through the May laws of 1873.

As the initial step in this programme, Grant urged in his Seventh Annual Message to Congress (Dec. 7, 1875) a constitutional amendment abolishing all religious teaching in the public schools and forbidding any public funds to be distributed to sectarian institutions. He recommended likewise a law compelling the States to tax church property. "The contemplation of so vast a property as here alluded to, without taxation," said Grant, "may lead to sequestration without constitutional authority and through blood." This, it need not be added, was the Kulturkampf method used in Germany during these years to crush the Catholic Church.

The word "sectarian" is used in this party of Grant's Annual Message, but everyone knew that the Catholic Church was intended and was thus to be made to pay the penalty for its increase in numbers and in wealth.

Attack On Catholic Loyalty.

The following year (1876) the Union Republican Congressional Executive Committee, with headquarters in Washington, D. C. Circulated far and wide a dastardly attack upon Catholic loyalty through a pamphlet entitled "Vaticanism in Germany and the United States." This was an imitation of the attack made by Gladstone, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in

1875, through his "Vaticanism in its bearing on Civil Allegiance," thereby giving new lift to the oldest Protestant Shibboleth--Double Allegiance. Cardinal Newman's answers, in what will ever be one of the greatest pamphlets in English literature--the "Letter to the Duke of Norfold"--appeared also in 1875.

Notwithstanding the fact that many American Protestants realized that this was a stale and senseless charge against their Catholic fellow-citizens, some of the Republican leaders planned the presidential campaign of 1876 upon this anti-Catholic platform.

In pursuance of this design, the Republican pamphlet mentioned above held up as a model the anti-Catholic and infidelistic policy of Bismarck and the leaders of the German Kulturkampf. "If knowledge of what has been done in Germany through priestism," we read, "will awaken our people to the depths of the same power in the United States, the firm stand of Bismarck has not been taken an hour too soon."

A contemporary French observer of our political maneuvers this year says: "Without any provocation on the part of Catholics, and in spite of the blood which many of them shed during the war for the profit of the North, a notable fraction of the Republican party has declared open war against Catholics and what they call its social and political influence.....Two journals, which are the special organs of President Grant, 'Harper's Weekly' and the 'New York Times,' subordinating national to party and sectarian interest, distinguished themselves in this disloyal war, and secret anti-Catholic associations have been recently founded under the same influence."

That the constitutional guarantees which protect the liberty and independence of the Catholic Church in the United States were in grave jeopardy during the memorable Centennial Year of 1876, no one who had read the newspapers and periodicals of that day may deny. Catholic leaders were not idle. There could be no question of forming here a Catholic Party for the protection of the Church, as Windhorst had thenn succeeded in accomplishing in Germany in the face of Bismarck's brutal attitude. Appeal could be made, however, to the saner element in Protestant circles by means of an objective, impartial presentation of Catholic doctrines.

Catholic Quarterly Review Started.

This was done through the founding in January, 1876, of a new periodical, "The American Catholic Quarterly Review," by Monsignor Corcoran, Dr. James O'Connor and Mr. George Dering Wolff of Philadelphia. It is significant that the first article deals with "Anti-Catholic Prejudice," by Dr. O'Connor, who was consecrated that same year as Vicar-Apostolic of Nebraska. Bishop O'Connor has contributed what must be the initial chapter in the psychological explanation of anti-Catholicism in this country.

For over a decade of year, the "Catholic World" had been bearing single-handedly the burden of Catholic defense and had been sending out month after month its appeal for a saner and truer understanding of Catholic truth. There was room for a quarterly of a high-class literary kind in the land, and Catholic writers of excellent taste and culture were ready for the task.

American literature at that time was still decidedly anti-Catholic. It is true that the vulgar "No Popery" output of pamphlets and books had ceased to a large extent; but, as Bishop O'Connor said, there was hardly a standard work on history, or popular science, or general literature, known to American readers, which, where it touched on Catholic subjects, did not purposely or unintentionally misrepresent us.

Catholics were not blind to the crisis of 1876. They realized that their enemies in this country lacked only the power to do what Bismarck was accomplishing for the time in Germany--the enslavement of the Church for political purposes. "When a President of the United States," writes Bishop O'Connor, "is not ashamed to hound on against us the veterans of the Army of the Tennessee, what may we not apprehend from the bad influence that can be brought to bear on men, who would themselves bring into their ranks the very passions it should be their duty to quell in others?"

Fairness of Millions of Protestants.

Grant was eliminated from the third term by the action of the House of Representatives; and when the campaign of 1876 between Hayes and Tilden was launched, liberal Republicans found that a partisan attack upon the Catholic Church would not win

the support of the better class of Americans of other faiths. "The people of the United States were not prepared to combine in a gratuitous assault upon the liberties of a large number of citizens, whose fidelity to our Constitution and laws have been attested and confirmed by their uniform loyalty ever since the first settlement of our country, and who, in every crisis and struggle through which as a people we have had to pass, have proved uniformly faithful, and have borne in every emergency their full share of burdens and sacrifices."

Again what threatened to be a national anti-Catholic crisis passed, owing to the noble American spirit of millions of sincere Protestants.

Article XXXIII--The Attack On Catholic Education.

(Our Sunday Visitor August 19, 1928)

The Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia in 1876 is one of the clearest dividing lines in our national history. Its unexpected success can hardly be exaggerated. The curtain rose that year upon a people badly disillusioned by political corruption and went down upon a scene unparlleled in our annals. The Hayes-Tilden contest for the presidency brought the nation to the sheer edge of civil war and bloodshed. But once safely emerged from that danger, our people awakened for the first time to the marvelous progress we had made in these hundred years. One evidence of this awakening was the large number of societies devoted to our national and local history which were founded in many parts of the country. Since 1876 these societies have multiplied until today there are more historical groups in the United States than in any other land in the world.

Modern Civilization's Debt to Church.

No institution was to profit more from this renaissance of historical interest in our past than the Catholic Church, since all impartial investigation heightened in the minds of scholars the immense debt modern civilization and culture owe to the Church.

The hundred years that had run their course since the birth of the nation in 1776 had been an uneasy period for Catholics in the United States. We have several retrospects or balance sheets written at the time by scholars such as John Gilmary Shea and others, and these display the fact that Protestant-American suspicion of the Church had not been confined to any particular social or political group. Catholicism had been denounced in season and out of seasonby leaders of powerful Protestant sects as a danger to the national unity on three counts--the old charge of divided allegiance, the separation of Catholics from the educational control of the States, and the dread of a tendency to social disunion as a result of the Catholic parochial school system.

The gallantry of Catholics on the battlefields and on the sea, the noble courage of our priests and nuns, and the patriotic stand taken by Archbishop Hughes, our most prominent prelate at that time, as well as by all the prelates of the North and South during the Civil War, practically shattered for all time the charge of potential disloyalty to American ideals. Not that this charge would never be heard again, for nativism has never been honest in making it; but when the mighty conflict of the Civil War was over, many of our sincere antagonists found to their surprise that of all the independently patriotic groups in the country, Catholics came first.

The other two charges were directed against Catholic independence in the matter of education, and with but few exceptions to the general rule, every attack upon the Church since 1876 has had this independence in view. The A. P. A. uprising in the nineties, like unto the Klan of our own day, disguised its real motive--a national drive on Catholic education--by a barrage of charges involving Catholic loyalty. The Spanish-American War (1898) silenced the first of these groups of bigots; the patriotism of Catholic soldiers, sailors, marines and chaplains in the World War (1917-1919) silenced, for a while, the second group.

Antagonism to Catholic Education.

Where Catholic writers and publicists have failed to a considerable extent in their estimate of all these anti-Catholic movements has been in not recognizing the fact that behind all the illogical opposition to the Church on the score of patriotic Americanism lies the No Popery antagonism to Catholic independence in the field of education. The anti-Catholic agitation both before 1876 and since has followed a uniform strategy in order to hide the active trend of its nativist principles. That trend or tendency has been to abridge religious and political liberty by acts of legislation which would prevent Catholics from educating their children in Catholic schools.

Persecution of Catholics for non-conformity to State religions was halted in the United States by the liberty enshrined in the federal Constitution; but persecution for non-conformity to that kind of political religionism whose chief fetish is the public school has never ceased. It is still implied as legally possible and advisable in the various attempts with which we are familiar, either by outlawing the Catholic school as was recently tried in Oregon, or by so powerfully financing the Public schools and by so regulating all education advance that Catholics would soon be out-distanced by their enemies.

Here then is a "conflicting loyalty"--to use a phrase from Dr. John A. Ryan's latest volume, "The Catholic Church and the Citizen." Here is a difference of viewpoint on which the Church could not compromise. In fact, the Church must go down to utter defeat on the question of religious education, rather than compromise with the secular or non-religious system of training in our public schools. There have been partial compromises in the past, but all have proven to be impracticable. "The Church," Dr. Ryan writes, "insists and must insist that religious training is an essential and, in fact, the most necessary element of education. Therefore she builds and maintains her own schools wherever the state institutions do not provide instruction in religion. Consequently she opposes legislation which would give the state a monopoly of education."

Now, the important factor in the school question with which every American Catholic ought to be perfectly familiar is this: by an insight into the policy of these new "levellers," the Catholic bishops of the United States have from Carroll's day to our own sensed instinctively that back of the whole nativist movement was the design first to limit and then to abolish all Catholic education in the land.

Abolition of Catholi School Sought.

Various stages may be discerned in the attack on the Catholic schools. During the early years of the nineteenth century, that is, up to the school controversy of 1840-42 in New York in which Archbishop Hughes figured so prominently, bishops and priests were mainly concerned about two things: the justice of their claim that our Catholic schools should be supported out of the public taxes gathered for educational purposes; and the risk Catholic children underwent in the public schools, owing to the reading of the Protestant Bible, the use of anti-Catholic text-books, and the undisguised Protestantism of these schools. Only occasionally, as can be seen in Dr. James A. Burns' two volumes on Catholic education in the United States, were subsidies allowed from public funds. But to expect the mass of the American people, shot through as it was with the venom of nativism, to vote for the support of our Catholic schools was futile. The platform of the two largest nativist parties--the Native-Americans of the 'forties and the Know-Nothings of the 'fifties--made this quite clear. What both parties sought was the abolition of the Catholic school, the enforced presence of Catholic children in the public schools, the use of the Protestant Bible "as a reading book," and the refusal to consider any change in text-books that violated truth and instilled doubt about religious belief.

This was more menacing to the progress of the Church than the violences and outrages which marked the rise and decline of nativist hatreds. At no moment from the first meeting of Bishop Carroll with his priests in 1791 up to the present has the American hierarchy wavered on the necessity of Catholic education for Catholic children in Catholic schools. Ably have been aided by Catholic educators, religious and lay, all through these years. Indeed, it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the greater part of our Catholic literature during this time has been devoted to the meaning and necessity of Catholic education.

Hierarchy's Support of Religious Education.

The first seven Provincial Councils of Baltimore (1829--1849) legislated for the Church in all the dioceses then suffragan to Baltimore; and it is highly significant to see how, with each assembly, especially when anti-Catholic fanaticism was at its peak, the realization grew that the essential point at issue in the Catholic Question in the United States was the protection of our Catholic children from the evils of a non-religious education.

The three Plenary Councils of 1852, 1866, and 1884, carried this legislation to its logical end. The Fathers of the Third Plenary Council--the last we have had in this country--sent out an eloquent plea to the faithful to realize the grave evils of so-called non-sectarian education. "If in any age," we read in the decrees devoted to the education of youth, "surely in ours are the Church of God and the Spirit of the Age locked in fearful and bitter combat over the education of youth. Men wholly inspired by a worldly spirit for many years have left not a single effort untried to usurp the Church's office of teaching Catholic youth received from Christ, and to deliver it into the hands of civil society or subject it to the power of secular government." The Pastoral Letter of 1884 emphasized the same fact: "Few, if any, will deny that a sound civilization must depend upon sound popular education--True civilization requires that not only the physical and intellectual but also the moral and religious well-being of the people should be promoted, and at least with equal care. Take away religion from a people, and morality would soon follow; morality gone, even their physical condition will ere long degenerate into corruption which breeds decrepitude, while their intellectual attainments would only serve as a light to guide them to deeper depths of vice and ruin. This has been so often demonstrated in the history of the past, and is, in fact, so self-evident, that one is amazed to find any difference of opinion about it. A civilization without relig-

ion would be a civilization of 'the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest,' in which cunning and strength would become the substitutes for principle, virtue, conscience and duty. As a matter of fact, there never has been a civilization worthy of the name without religion; and from the facts of history the laws of human nature can easily be inferred."

Catholic School Stronghold of Faith.

The nursery of Christian life is the Catholic home; its stronghold is the Catholic school--in these words the American hierarchy in its Pastoral Letter of 1919 continued the challenge to the ever-growing forgetfulness of God in our public school educational system. The so-called "conflicting loyalties" which furnished a basis for so much of the anti-Catholic agitation of the past have lost their potency in the light of the magnificent loyal of Catholics to the best ideals of our democratic system of government. But Catholics must ever be alert to the fact that with them, even more so than with others, eternal vigilance will be the price of their independence in educational affairs.

The drive on Catholicism has never faltered in its extent and purpose since the sixteenth century. This generation may not see a recrudescence of the prejudice latent in millions of Protestant hearts, but the will to block Catholic education never dies. When that prejudice does reveal itself again, it will be under a new guise, but its method and purpose will be as old as the anti-Catholic struggle itself; and it will undoubtedly center its entire attack upon the freedom of the Catholic Church in the United States to maintain its stand upon religious education.

Article XXXIV--The Catholic Question and the Plenary Councils of Baltimore. (1852, 1866, 1884)

(Our Sunday Visitor, August 26, 1928)

Three times during the latter half of the nineteenth century the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church in the United States met in a national plenary assembly at Baltimore.

The story of the Catholic Questionas it was considered by these prelates is filled with significance.

It is natural to expect in periods of blatant nativism that a plenary council of our spiritual leaders would be led unaboidably to discuss the tantalizing problem of the persistence of anti-Catholicism in the nation. And yet, in all these solemn assemblies, in the private and public sessions of the prelates and theologians, no word of recrimination, no syllable which does not express the spirit of charity toward all who had outraged the Church, can be found.

Attractive Chapter in Catholic History.

Fromthe narrative of the deliberations at Baltimore, first in 1852, then fourteen years later in 1866, and eighteen years afterwards in 1884, readers of today may learn one of the most attractive chapters in Catholic history. It is a chapter suffused with Christian love for our enemies, of sincere faith in God's designs upon the land, and of sublime trust that through His grace, as the years would pass, non-Catholics in general would be brought to a realization of the providential part Catholicism has had in the nation's development.

When the first of these three Plenary Councils met in our oldest episcopal city (May 9-10, 1852), the Church of the United States was composed of six archdioceses or provinces (Baltimore, Cincinnati, St. Louis, New Orleans, New York and Oregon), with twenty-eight suffragan Sees, making in all thirty-four dioceses two vicariates-apostolic. The "Metropolitan Catholic Almanac" gives us the following statistics for 1852; churches, 1411; mission stations, 681; priests, 1,385; seminarians, 421; and a Catholic population of 1,980,000. The number of Catholic periodicals is listed as eleven, and Brownson's "Quarterly Review" is advertised as our formost literary journal.

Among the prelates present at the Council of 1852 were some who had become nationally recognized for scholarship and for patriotic leadership. The six archbishops (the two Kenricks, F. N. Blanchet, Anthony Blanc, John Hughes and John B. Purcell) were all in the full maturity of their intellectual powers. Peter Richard Kenrick of St. Louis was the youngest of the six and Anthony Blanc of New Orleans was the oldest. The ages ran from forty-six to sixty. Archbishops F. P. Kenrick and Purcell had taken part in the last six Provincial Councils of Baltimore and so were able to bring to the deliberations of our first national assembly a wealth of experience for the problems under consideration. Of the four remaining Archbishops, Blanc of New Orleans had participated in the last five Councils, Peter Richard Kenrick and John Hughes had been present at two, while Blanchet, whose archdiocese embraced the unsettled wastes of the old Oregon Territory, was present for the first time.

The various problems discussed in the Council of 1852 need not detain us; what interests us most is the attitude of the prelates and their theologians towards the growing power of the anti-Catholic political movements of the day.

Eight years has passed since Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, who presided over the Council as Apostolic Delegate, had witnessed the reign of terror created by the Native-Americans in Philadelphia in 1844, when to escape maltreatment he was obliged to take refuge in the house of a friendly Protestant minister, Rev. Dr. Tyng, and when the Blessed Sacrament was taken to friendly Protestant homes for safety.

Four years later (1848) when the anti-Catholic world sang a song of triumph over the capture of Rome by the Freemasons as well as over the flight of Pope Pius 1X to Gaeta, Dr. Kenrick led his fellow-bishops in inviting the Sovereign Pontiff to come to the United States and make his temporary domicile with us.

Kenrick was not deceived over the apparent disavowal of nativist policies by political leaders, and his transfer to the Archbishopric of Baltimore in 1851 after Dr. Eccleston's death placed him at the helmof the Barque of Peter in this country--a fitting reward for the scholar whose "Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated"--holds today a high place in American Catholic apoligetical literature.

Bishop's Plea for Patriotism.

In 1852, some lingering echoes might still be heard of the anti-Catholic animosities which had crept into the war with Mexico (1846-1848). Nevertheless, the prelates of 1852 deemed silence the better weapon to use in thwarting the revival of "No Popery" in this day. They understood, however, that their people, scattered like the children of Israel all over the land and in daily conflict with those who considered their presence a menace to American institutions, would be heartened by a word of encouragement in the face of what they knew was a coming storm of opposition to Catholic progress. and so, in their Pastoral Letter of 1852, we find a restatement of the meaning of civil allegiance which reveals the minds of the bishops of the Council: "Obey the public authorities, not only for wrath but also for conscience's sake. Show your attachment to the institutions of our beloved country by prompt compliance with all their requirements, and by the cautious jealousy with which you guard against the least deviation from the rules which they prescribe for the maintenance of public order and private rights. Thus will you refute the idle babbling of foolish men, and will best approve yourselves worthy of the privileges which you enjoy, and over come, by the sure test ofpractical patriotism, all the prejudices which a misapprehension of your principles but too often produces."

Fourteen years were to pass before the convocation of the Second Plenary Council in 1866--fourteen years crowded with the disheartening scenes of another outbreak against the Church as well as with the supreme tragedy of our history, the Civil War.

Outrages of Know-Nothing Mobs.

The Bedini incident of 1853-54 had been used as a plausible excuse for the founding of the Know-Nothing Party, though the actual reason was the coming presidential election of 1856. Rioting was renewed. Churches were sacked and burned. Priests and nuns were insulted and beaten, and a climax was reached in the unspeakable outrage commited by Protestant fanatics on Father John Bapst, S. J., of Ellsworth, Maine. Bills for the inspection of convents passed several legislatures and only the outbreak of the Civil War prevented the spread of furthur violence. After the Civil War was over, the country underwent another frenzy of anti-Catholic feeling in the trial of the conspirators who are alleged to have aided John Wilkes Booth.

These are but a few of the salience facts which might be offered to prove the strength of an ever-latent anti-Catholicism in the land between 1852 and 1866.

The Council of 1866 was opened under the presidency of Archbishop Martin John Spalding, in whose elevation to the See of Baltimore after Kenrick's death (July 8, 1863), the United States Government came dangerously near to unconstitutional interference in ecclesiastical affairs. There were present during its sessions (October 7-21, 1866) seven archbishops, thirty-nine bishops, and two mitred abbots, representing a Church composed of 1770 priests, 2930 churches, and a Catholic population of 3,842,000 souls. The Second Plenary Council has been called the largest assembly of its kind since the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. The racial composition of the hierarchy was significant. Sixteen of the prelates were American born; twelve hailed from France; nine were from Ireland; three from Spain; two from Germany; and one each from Austria, Switzerland and Belgium. Three were converts--Bishop Wood (Philadelphia, Bayley (Newark), and Rosecrans (Cincinnati).

An examination of all the private and public discussions during the fortnight the Council was in session displays nowhere any foreboding on the part of the prelates over the Catholic Question in the United States. The loyalty of Catholic soldiers during the Civil War was indeed too well known to need discussion. Even in the Pastoral Letter, issued on October 21, 1866, there is no direct reference to the violent outbreaks under Know-Nothing direction during the fourteen years which had passed since the assembly of 1852. The silence of the hierarchy is indeed significant. More significant still is the remarkably absence in the fourteen sermons delivered in the Cathedral of Baltimore of any reference to the abuse and villification which had signalized this period. There is but one interpretation of this silence--Christian charity and Christian prudence. It was a living potent example of the command of Christ--exemplified by these His apostles in the New World--to love their enemies, to do good to them with hate in their hearts, and to pray for them whose methods were persecution and calumniation.

The beneficent effect of this Christian forebearance was visible during the eighteen years which separated the Second and Third Plenary Councils (1866-1884). With the sole exception of the crisis which occurred in the Centennial Year (1876), these years were comparatively free from the Anti-Catholic propaganda of former decades and they stand out as a period when a fairer and more liberal appraoch was made by non-Catholics towards an understanding of the Mother Church of the ages.

Third Plenary Council.

When the Third Plenary Council opened its sessions on November 9, 1884, under the presidency of the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop James Gibbons of Baltimore, the progress revealed by that assembly was almost beyond belief. In eighteen years the number of our bishops had doubled. The American priesthood had increased from 2770 to 7043; the churches and missions had multiplied from 2030 to 6626, with an additional 1895 stations where Mass was said at regular intervals; and from a Catholic population of about four million souls, the Church in the United States had grown to a mighty phalanx of nearly eight millions.

Unquestionably, the Council of 1884 was one of the most remarkable assemblies of its kind in modern times. A recent biographer of Cardinal Gibbons has summed up the Council in these words: "Many subjects were considered in the Council, including changes in the discipline and administration of the Church in this country. The country was making such tremendous strides forward, and Catholicity was keeping pace with it, that such changes were demanded. The debates of the sessions covered all phases of the various questions discussed. There was an Ireland in that Council, a Ryan, a Keane, a Spalding, men whose oratorical ability held the delegates spellbound by virtue of their eloquence and whose arguments provoked deep thought. With the greatest ecclesiastical minds of the United States there, all conscious of their responsibility before Almighty God, all loving the Church with a loyalty and devotion intense in quality, the Council reflected in all its proceedings the real spirit of the Church, and its work redounded to the greater honor and glory of God. So successful was it that it was taken as a model for similar Councils held in Ireland, Australia and other parts of the world."

We have here one of the great turning points in the history of the Church in this country. There has been no Plenary Council since 1884, and in the forty-four years which have passed since its sessions closed, its decrees and enactments have been the motive force which has carried the American Church forward to a success unparalleled in Catholic history. It would take us too far from the main theme of our story, namely, the history of the Catholic Question in the United States, to sketch even briefly the men who participated in this great assembly. Veritably, they forgot nothing which might in any way strengthen the faith and the discipline of their flocks. Nor were they unmindful that in spite of all that the Church had contributed to the moral and religious advancement of the nation, there were many whose hold on the No-Popery traditions could not be loosened. In splendid phrases that rang through the land, they wrote again in the Pas-

toral Letter of December 7, 1884, the story of Catholic loyalty to American ideals and challenged the Church's enemies to disprove the innate concord between Catholic principles and American institutions.

Sounded a New Note.

In the Second and Third Plenary Councils a new note was heard in the sermons delivered at these assemblies. This new note was something more than re petition of the assurance of Catholic loyalty. The leaders of 1866 and 1884 took Catholic patriotism so much for granted that none of the precious hours of the Councils was wasted discussing the old-time and thread-worn objections of Double Allegiance. Rather was it a note of warning to the American people that Protestantism as a religion and as a policy carried in its very heart the seeds of the dissolution of the Republic. The intellectual and moral anarchy which was everywhere visible as the result of the disintegration of Protestant beliefs, the impossibility of separating Protestant doctrine from the inherent right it gave to every man to rebel against any civil authority placed over him, and the all-pervading historic fact of Protestant political evolution, namely, its natural and inevitable tendency towards despotism, which has become more apparent in our own day--this is the main burden of the message sentout to America from Baltimore at this time.

Let us not forget what may have been less understood a generation ago, that in the person of the new leader of the Faith in this country a better feeling between those of opposing beliefs could hardly fail to be felt and that in the person of the prelate who signed first his beloved name to the patriotic avowal of the Pastoral of 1884, not only the Church but the country as well had found its foremost defender--James Cardinal Gibbons.

Article XXXV--The Voice of the Catholic Laity
(1889)

(Our Sunday Visitor, September 2, 1928)

Three rather diversified anniversaries were celebrated in the year 1889. The first was the centennial of the Constitution of the United States (April 30) ; the second was the hundredth anniversary of the firth of the French Revelution (May 5); and third was the jubilee of the foundation of our American hierarchy (November 6, 1789), when Father John Carroll was appointed first Bishop of Baltimore.

The Baltimore Centennial was hailed by Catholic Americans with an enthusaism which stands apart in our history. The jubilee of Bishop Carroll's appointment was celebrated on November 10, 1889, and was followed by a Lay Congress in Baltimore, one of the unique events in American Catholic annals. The festivites closed with the solemn dedication of the Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. Of these three celebrations, the Lay Congress of November 11-12, 1889, has a particularly important place in the history of the Catholic Question in the United States.

To Archbishop Ireland and Major Henry F. Brownson, the son son of Dr. Orestes A. Brownson, credit is due for the organization and the successful assembly of lay delegates from all parts of the Union for a general meeting of the Catholic laity in this country. For the first time in our history the laity were given the opportunity of expressing their views collectively on subjects of prime importance to Catholic progress.

Keynote of Lay Congress.

The keynote of the Congress was given by Cardinal Gibbons in his Pastoral Letter of October 8, 1889, announcing the celebration of the centennial of the American hierarchy: "The calm judgment of posterity recognizes John Carroll as a providential agent in molding the diverse elements in the United States into an organzed Church. He did not wish the Church to vegetate as a delicate exotic plant; he wished it to become a sturdy tree, deeprooted in the soil, to grow with the bloom and the development of the country, inured to its climate, braving its storms and invigorated by them and yielding abundantly the fruits of sanctification, Knowing as he did, the mischief bred by national

rivalries, his aim was that the clergy and people--no matter from what country they sprang, should be thoroughly identified with the land in which their lot is cast, they should study its laws and political constitution, and be in harmony with its spirit; in a word, that they should become as soon as possible assimilated to the social body in all things appertaining to the domain of civil life."

This note of true Americanism was not new in the utterances of Cardinal Gibbons. Twice before 1889 this greatest of our Catholic leaders had spoken in terms of the purest patriotism; once, in his gallant defence of the Knights of Labor, and again when he took possession of his titular Church of Santa Maria in Trastevere in Rome. "For myself," he said on this latter occasion, "as a citizen of the United States, and without closing my eyes to our shortcomings as a nation, I say, with deep sense or pride and gratitude, that I belong to a country where the civil government holds over all of us the aegis of its protection without interfering with us in the legitimate exercises of our sublime mission as ministers of the Gospel of Christ. Our country has liberty without license and authority without despositm."

Much was made of these celebrated words at the time both in Rome and in the United States, and a wave of enthusiasm over his message sped across our country carrying all on its crest. On that day, Cardinal Gibbonswon an affectionate place in the hearts of high-minded and patriotic Americans which he never lost.

Archbishop Ryan's Prediction.

All who participated in the Baltimore Centennial during those four days of November 1889, echoed the spirit of the Cardinal. Enthusiasm for the Faith and the patriotism for our country throbbed in everyCatholic heart. In spite of divisions--and there were many of a racial, political and industrial kind--Catholic laymen and women in every part of the land hailed with joy the opportunity of proclaiming publicly through a great national lay congress their allegiance to God and country. Even the conservative Patrick John Ryan, the Chrysostom of the American Church, the successor of bishops who had witnessed the sad results of lay interference in ecclesiastical affairs, said in his Centennial sermon: "It is now time that an active, educated laity should take and express interest in the great questions of the day affecting the Church and society. I believe that there is not in the world a more devoted laity than we have in the Church of these States. I find, too, that the best educated among them, and notably the converts, are sound on the great questions of the day and loyal to the Church--A magnificent future is before the Church in this country, if we are only true to her, to the country, and to ourselves."

There is no doubt that these sentiments struck a sympathetic chord in the hearts of the lay delegates who gathered for the Congress on November 11, 1889. They came away from the venerable Catherdral of Baltimore the evening before thrilled with the prophetic message of another great leader in the Church, Archbishop John Ireland.

Need of Lay Action Stressed.

"The strength of the Church today in all countries," he told them, "particularly in America, is the people. This is essentially the age of democracy." In vibrant words he called the laymen present to Catholic action. "Priests are officers, You are soldiers. The heaviest fighting is often done by the soldiers, and in the warfare against error and sin, the soldier is not always near the officer, and he must be ready to strike without waiting for the command. Laymenare not anointed in Confirmation to the end that they merely save their own souls and pay their pew rent. They must think, work, organize, read, speak, act, as circumstances demand, ever anxious to serve the Church and to do good to their fellow-men. There is on the part of Catholic laymen too much leaning upon priests. If priests-work, laymen imagine they can rest--In America, in the present age, lay action is particularly needed for the Church. Laymen in this age have a special vocation."

It is not surprising then, to find in the various sessions of the Lay Congress during the two following days an amazing enthusiasm for the work of the second century of our organizaed hierarchical life than at its dawn. Under the leadership of a former Governor of Maryland, John Lee Carroll, who was president of the Congress, the objects of this first Catholic national assembly of men were clearly outlined and strictly adhered to. To the astonishment of all the non-Catholic organizations, political and religious, in the country, it was demonstrated that Catholic men from every part of the United States could meet and discuss vital problems of the day without in any way encroaching upon political matters. Among the papers read were : "Catholic Congresses of Europe," by John Gilmary Shea; "Lay Action in the Church," by Henry Brownson: "The Independence of the Holy See," by Charles J. Bonaparte; "The New Social Order," by Peter L. Foy; "The Catholic Press," by George Dering Wolff; "Catholic Literature," by Conde B. Pallen; "Temperance," by John H. Campbell; "Education," by Judge Dunne; and "Church Music," by Herman Allen. Not all these papers were of equal worth, and though all had been seen and revised beforehand by a special committee of which Archbishop Ireland was chairman, they give expression here and there to sentiments, opinions, and bold judgments which show conclusively that a perfect freedom of speech was allowed to the speakers.

Daniel Dougherty's Address.

The opening address of the Congress, by the most dramatic orator in America at the time, Daniel Dougherty, produced an indescribably effect upon the delegates. One passage merits repetition: "We assert that we are pre-eminently Americans and had it not been for Catholics and the Catholic Church, there would have been no America; the continent would be unknown. It was to Catholics that that liberty which is the essence of all liberty--freedom to worship God--was established here by them, and by them alone. It was priests, aye, Jesuits, Dominican missionaries, who first sought and explored our land, penetrated into the wilderness, tracked the streams and gave sainted names to localities, bays, lakes and rivers. It was the holy sacrifice of the Mass that was the first offering to the true God upon this continent. It was Catholic nations that came first to the resuce of the revolutionary fathers in the war against the greatest of Protestant powers. A signer of the Declaration of Independence was a Catholic. The name of the first Archbishop of Baltimore is linked with Benjamin Franklin. The Catholic Church has given to the republic heroes in every war, and in every battle on field or flood Catholics have sealed their fidelity with their lives. We are here today, the Roman Catholic laity of the United States, to proclaim to all the world that our country is tied to every fibre of our hearts, and no human power can shake our fidelity."

Dr. Shea's paper was a justification for the assembly itself, and was a worthy introduction to Brownson's descritpion of lay cooperation in Church affairs in the past. Brownson was as bold as his illustrious father had often been in the days before the Civil War, and in striking the note of the necessity of winning the confidence of the bishops and priests for the work which lay ahead, he touched upon an underlying problem of the Congress--one, indeed, which had its effect during the generation that followed.

For, the Congress had its critics within Catholic ranks. Too many subjects had been dealt with in its sessions for an adequate discussion of any one of them. With the exception of the two short speeches at the beginning and at the end of the Congress by Archbishops Gross and Ireland, the laymen were left to themselves. Most of the bishops were obliged to leave while the Congress was in session in order to be present at the dedication of the University. Hopes were expressed that in future Congresses more time would be available for discussions of mooted points in Catholic social action and welfare, but the Congress of 1889 stands as a unique experiemtn of this kind, until our own day.

Congress Excited General Interest.

The Centennial excited considerable interest in the press of the world at that time. The retrospect of the hundred years gone by revealed a remarkable progress in the spread of the Faith and in our institutions of learning and of charity. That the numerical increase alone from 40,000 in 1789 to over nine million souls in 1889, with eight-four archbishops and bishops, where a hundred years before, there was but one, and with over 7,000 priests laboring in the vineyard, where in 1789 there were not fifty--that all these signs of inward strength and vitality should attract non-Catholic attention and interest was natural.

Another aspect of the Congress should be noted since it came from the lips of laymen--the consciousness that the time had come to assume a different attitude towards non-Catholic America. Heretofore, that attitude had been a defensive one. We had been obliged all along this first century of our organized Church to repel attacks upon the Faith by those who were presumably Christians. But on all sides, especially by Protestant leaders, it was at last recognized that outside of the Catholic Church Christian principles of right living and of doctrine were fast disintegrating before the seeping in of a new paganism which was visible in all classes of society. "It is beyond all question," wrote one of the observers of the Congress," that the future of the Christian religion in this country is in the hands of the Catholic Church. This is admitted openly and tacitly on every side. If Christianity is to continue a factor in the growth of our civilization, it must be a CatholicChristianity. Every other form of Christian belief has lost its vitality and complete disintegration is only a matter of years." And yet, it was remarked at the time by leading secular newspapers that in all the declarations of the Congress, every religious, social and educational problem dealt with in its session was considered with careful regard for Protestant sentiment and Protestant prejudices.

Historic, therefore, in the chronicle of American Catholicism was this first assembly of laymen who were thus enabled publicly to express their allegiance to the nation's ideals and their unswerving loyalty to the Faith. It was a swift, dramatic, unforgettable answer from the hearts of nine million Americans to the Catholic Question of the United States.

Article XXXVI--The American Protective Association

(1893)

(Our Sunday Visitor, September 9, 1928)

Two centennials had coincided in 1889. The one, the anniversary of Washington's assuming the presidency; the other, John Carroll's election as the first Bishop of Baltimore. The Baltimore Cenntennial had undoubtedly helped to create a more liberal understanding of the Catholic Question in the United States; but, in spite of the efforts made by Catholics and non-Catholics to lay forever the ghost of bigotry in the land, nativism was not dead. Indeed, all that was needed to fan again to vigorous life the flames of anti-Catholic prejudice was a pretext. Any pretext would do; and, as we shall see, the pretext chosen was the least expected of the many Catholic progress seemed to offer.

American Party's Platform.

The year before the Baltimore Centennial was a presidential year, and in addition to the three major parties, (Republican, Democrats, and Prohibitionists), several new groups appeared, one of which, a recrudescence of the old Know-Nothing spirit, called itself the American Party. Its platform, while not mentioning Catholics, called for the repeal of the naturalization laws, the abolition of private schools, and the exclusion of all who could not read English from the exercise of the suffrage. The insignificant vote cast for its candidates indicated clearly that the voters could no longer be marshalled into a distinct anti-Catholic party. From that time to this a new policy has been followed, first by the American Protective Association in 1893, and latterly by theKu Klux Klan; namely, not to announce candidates of its own, but to support those of either of the major parties who were in accord with anti-Catholic policies.

The Baltimore Centennial with its crowning glory of the establishment of the Catholic University of America and with the presence of a papal legate in the person of Archbishop Satolli aroused somewhat these latent animosities; but it was not until three years later (1892) when Satolli returned to the United States as the official representative of the Holy See for the World's Fair at Chicago, that mutterings were heard about

Roman encroachments in our public affairs. In January, 1893, Satolli was appointed Apostolic Delegate in the United States. Henry F. Bowers, founder of the American Protective Association, admitted that Satolli's presence was the cause of the rapid spread of this organization. "We looked upon Satolli", he writes, "as a representative of the Propaganda at Rome to direct and influence legislation in this country, more especially his settling down in the city of Washington, and several moves which were made, which I cannot just now call to mind, which gave rise to an opinion that he was interfering with the public institutions of this country."

Spread of the A. P. A.

The origin of the American Protective Association is traced to Clinton, Iowa, where a small group was organized as early as 1887. It had a lingering existence until 1893, when it began to spread. Hemphrey J. Desmond, whose monograph on the A. P. A. is the only authoritative account we have of the movement claims that among the factors in the anti-Catholic situation which gave the new organization such rapid strength the following can be considered as causes: (1) the hereditary Protestant antagonism and suspicion of the Catholic Church and Catholic citizenship; (2) the prejudice frequently engendered by the conduct of Irish American politicians; (3) the Catholic attitude on the school question; and (4) the occasional Catholic society parade or demonstration, which was calculated to alarm the bigots who witnessed it; To these might be added the Catholic celebrations held all over the country in October, 1892, in memory of Columbus, the Catholic Discoverer of the New world.

The American Protective Association began its active operations by a nation-wide distribution of two forged documents. One of these was an alleged papal encylical, dated April, 1893, which contained explicit instructions to Catholics, absolving all members of the Church fromtheir allegiance to the United States, and ordering the massacre of all Protestants "on or about the feast of St. Ignatius in the Year of our Lord, 1893." Every A. P. A. paper in the country believed or pretended to believe that this forgery was genuine.

When July 31, 1893, came and went without the announced massacre, the scare was not over. Too many had prepared themselves with shot and shell and weapons to sell their lives dearly to be convinced that the massacre was a gigantic hoax. As a result, thousands poured into the American Protective Association until its membership in 1896 is said to have reached a total of over four millions.

The presidential campaign of 1896 gave the new nativist organization its chance to influence national politics. The old nativist groups, the Native-Americans and the Know-Nothings, had striven for supremacy with their own candidates. The A.P.A. method was to work in secret to obtain a dominating voice in one of the existing political parties. Many local elections were carried in this way between 1893 and 1896, and the stage was set for larger successes in State and federal campaigns.

The A. P. A. Oath.

The oath taken by the members of the A. P. A. was a revamping of the older Know-Nothing pledge--"I will use my utmost power to strike the shackles and chains of blind obedience to the Roman Catholic Church from the hampered and bound consciences of a priest-ridden and church-oppressed people--I furthermore promise and swear that I will not countenance the nomination in any caucus or convention of a Roman Catholic for any office in the gift of the American people, and that I will not vote for, or counsel others to vote for, any Roman Catholic, but will vote only for a Protestant, so far as may lie in my power, that I will at all times endeavor to place the political positions of this government in the hands of Protestants to the entire exclusion of the Roman Catholic Church, of the members thereof, and the mandate of the Pope."

The public avowals of the A. P. A. leaders were of course a blind to the real purpose of the organization, although sufficient was made public to emphasize the social and political anti-Catholicism of the group. Unlike the earlier nativists, the members of the A. P. A. were not all "simon-pure Americans." The organization opened its ranks to every species of anti-Catholic bigot and fanatic, and all these radical groups had particular objects in using the ever-growing power of the Association. Pressure was brought to bear upon men of the professional classes to become members, and it goes without saying that in the ranks were to be found thousands of Protestant ministers who saw a chance for a little extra emoluments becoming the official voices of the anti-Catholicism the society had aroused.

"Ex-Priests" and "Ex-Nuns" Exploited.

With the A. P. A. movement originated many of the spectacular methods with which we have grown familiar in our days--lectures by "ex-priests"and "ex-nuns," bogus Jesuit oaths, church basements garrisoned with arms and ammunition, boycotting, sabotage, and the over-shadowing spectre of the Pope directing our ballot-boxes.

"Very naturally", says Desmond, who has painstakingly gathered all these facts, "Catholic citizens made a vigorous opposition to the A. P. A. and almost everywhere they had the best of the battle in the open forum. Their press was unremitting in its assault upon the new movement. Large public meetings and anti-A. P. A. lectures and pamphlets were among the means employed. Here and there counter associations were formed for purposes of defense; and in many places the council meetings ofthe A. P. A. were systematically watched and lists of the members procured and circulated. The Catholic agitation against it had localized it by driving it wholly out of the democratic party and advertising it as a thing hated and despised by all Catholics."

Public opinion was decidedly against the secret methods of the new anti-Catholic organization, for it was felt that an oath-bound society could not be in strict conformity with the liberty, justice and equality of American institutions. "Birds of the night," wrote one Protestant critic, "are never birds of wisdom....They are for the most part birds of prey. The fate of the Republic is sealed when bats take the lead of the eagles." The padded membership lists of the American Protective Association were gradually exposed, and both the major political parties, while not averse to using A. P. A. influence to win elections, saw their own autonomy placed in jeopardy should this latestanti-Catholic craze become so strong nationally as to dominate the presidential election in 1896. "The small and ridiculous figure it cut in the campaign," says Desmond, "was an eye-opener even to the most stupid politicians."

A. P. A. Attack on McKinley.

In April, 1896, an attack was made in A. P. A. press upon McKinley, who was forced (through Mark Hanna), to deny that he was a member of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and that he was not connected with the Catholic Young Men's Institute, nor that he was ruled by Bishop Watterson ofColumbus. Hanna himself did not escape the charge of being secretly a Roman Catholic. The national convention of the A. P. A. held in Washington, D. C., on May 12, 1896, scored McKinley and his leading supporters with Roman Catholic affiliations of some kind. All were swayed more or less, they said, by Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, "the most Jesuitical and dangerous papal leader in this country." Thetide of popular favor was, however, strongly set towards McKinley, and was not stemmed by his public disavowal of all sympathy with A. P. A. policies, and he was nominated by the Republican convention at St. Louis, in June, 1896.

All that was left to the discredited anti-Catholic bigots was the ludicrously unsuccessful attempt to have their principles embodied in the Republican platform. Failing at St. Louis, the A. P. A. lobbyists went to Chicago to the Democratic convention, but political leaders were too sagacious even to consider the request made to them. "In fact," as Desmond sagely says, "it seems probable that during the year 1895-1896, the A. P. A. was considerably more of a vexation to the leaders of the Republican party than to the prelates of the Catholic Church."

Deserted by thousands in the campaign which followed the summer conventions of the two major parties, the American Protective Association sank into the dismal swamp of its anti-Catholic forebears.

Article XXXVII--Conversions.

(Our Sunday Visitor, September 16, 1928)

An impartial analysis of anti-Catholic prejudice in the United States during the nineteenth century discloses several factors which are seldom emphasized. One of these is the deadly monotony in the methods followed, in the purposes agreed upon, and in the general failure which attended these efforts to popularize religious bigotry.

Few Americans are familiar with the anti-Catholic history of our country from the days of John Jay to Thomas Heflin. Fewer still realize that in this curious phenomenon of American social life there has been little change in No Popery's long life from colonial times to ourown. Various names are indeed given to the anti-Catholic groups--American Protestant Association, Native-Americans, Know-Nothings, American Protective Association and the Ku Klux Klan--but all have had practically identical aims and purposes. Whatever differences there have been are too slight to need special treatment. There is, however, one aspect of these anti-Catholic movements which should be mentioned, not indeed for the purpose of reviving scandals long since forgotten, but to bring out into clearer light an important consequence of anti-Catholicism in the United States, namely its tremendous influence in the work of conversions to the true Faith.

Apostate Priests

All along the years of the nineteenth century, Protestant pulpiteers and the Protestant press have been largely aided in their persistent attacks upon the Church by apostate priests. The latter half of the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the following century saw one of the most scurrilous anti-Catholic publications, the "History of the Popes," by the apostate Jesuit, Archibald Bower, in most of the private and public libraries of New England. Its influence for evil and for hatred of the papacy has seldom been equalled. The second quarter of

the nineteenth century was ushered in by the publication at Georgetown, D. C., of the "Practical and Internal Evidence Against Catholicism," by the apostate secular priest, Joseph Blanco White, of Seville, who joined the Anglican ministry in 1812. The middle years of the century saw the Yankee pedlars scattering far and wide, espcially in the Ohio Valley, copies of "The Master Key of Popery," by another secular apostate priest Anthony Gavin, of Saragossa, who had likewise become an Anglican. Added to these should be mentioned the vulgar productions of William Hogan, the notorious apostate priest of Philadelphia, whose "Popery as it Was and Is," and Nunneries and Confession," were a close second to the obscene books of the "ex-nuns," Maria monke and Rebecca Reed. Nor should it be forgotten that when the first organized anti-Catholic society was founded (1829) by the Protestant ministry of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Pennsylvania--the American Protestant Association--it was an ex-priest who edited its filthy publication, "The Protestant." The Know-Nothing movement had as one of its chief abettors the ex-Barnabite monk, Anthony Gavazzi, who was largely responsible for the demonstrations against Arch-bishop Bedina in 1853.

This is the unpleasant phase in the story of the Catholic Question in the United States, but it should not be ignored; for it is part of that river of religious antagonism which "has flowed down through our history since Protestants first penetrated the American continent and took root therein."

Protestant Bigotry Made Catholic Converts.

Looking backward no one can deny the fact that the rioting and outrages by the nativists, the ceaseless attacks on the Church from the Protestant pulpit and press, the filthiness, obscenity and scurrility of much of the anti-Catholic literature, and the frenzied efforts to violate basic American idealism by disfranchising Catholics, had as their most important effects the stirring of the spirit in thousands of Protestant hearts who were eventually swept high and safe upon the banks of the river of bigotry and who in consequence discovered the falsity of the traditional Protestant view and entered the fold of the Catholic Church to find peace at last for their souls.

In an excellent summary of the causes of conversion in the United States--"The American Convert Movement"--Fahter Edward Mannix tells us that "the strangest antithesis of all, and indicative of the lesson God would teach the subsequent generations, are the conversions occasioned by the example of bitter and public anti-Catholics. The history of the Faith in this country contains not a few relatives of such agitators--sometimes the agitators themselves. Anyone familiar with the events

of the time, remembers the founder of the Native Americans, a proscriptive organization. Lewis C. Levin represented his party in Congress, defended it on the platform, and led rioters under circumstances we do not care to describe. He was repaid by seeing his wife and her entire family embrace the Faith. The same return fell to General Humphrey Marshall, leader of Know-Nothingism in Kentucky, whose wife, Francis McAllister Marshall, and daughter made their open profession of Faith. Miss Emma Etheridge will go down in history as the convert daughter of Amerson Etherdge, and Mrs. Edgar P. Thompson, the convert daughter of Benjamin H. Hill, both Know-Nothing leaders in Congress. General William Russell Smith, whose bitter words are recorded in the "Congressional Record" for January 15, 1855, lived to see the day when he himself, would, after the manner of Clovis, the proud King of the Franks, "burn what he had adored and adore what he had burned." Rev. John J. Slocum was the one responsible for the publication of that unfortunate work known as "Maria Monk's Revelations," The baptismal records of Long Beach, New Jersey, contain the family name twice, Miss Susan Elizabeth Slocum and her sister, Mrsl Malvava Jemima Slocum Chamberlain, both nieces."

Work of Pioneer Priests

There are several high water marks in the history of conversions in the United States. We forget too easily that for two and a half centuries before the birth of our nation in 1776, the Catholic Church through its priests had been actively engaged upon the work of converting and civilizang the Indians in all parts of our country. That glorious epoch of apstolic labor and hardships for the cause of Christ was a fitting prelude to the almost unbelievable work of conversion which has gone on without abreak ever since. By sacrifices innumerable and by martyrdoms for the Faith which literally baptized every section of theUnited States in blood, the harvest of conversions among the savages can only be justly likened to the great missionary labors among the barbarian tribes of the fifth and sixth centuries. With hearts ablaze for the Cross of Christ, these pioneers priests of America travelled the wilderness of the New World, preaching the gospel to the natives and winning a conquest for the Church and for civilization which has never been honestly appreciated by American historians. Franciscans, Dominicans, Jesuits, Sulpicians, Oblates and Secular priests have shared in the immortal record.

Some Notable Conversions

Not only among the Indians but among the white Protestant settlers as well was the work of conversion carried on. Maryland itself, the foundation of the convert son of a convert father, was the scene of our earliest conversions. In the other colonies, in spite of laws proscribing the Faith, there are records of conversions that have about them a veritable touch of the supernatural. The conversion of Colonel Lionel

Brittin of Philadelphia, (1707), of the Congregational ministre, the Rev. John Thayer of Boston (1783), of Prince Demetrius Gallitzin, the second priest to be ordained by Bishop Carroll (1795), of Governor Thomas Sim Lee of Maryland (1800), of Mother Seton (1805), and of the remarkable Barber family of New Hampshire (1817), are among the better known examples of the gift of Faith in these early times.

Everywhere in the young States where Protestant diatribe was voiced from non-Catholic pulpits, men and women of intelligance and of social standing were led to investigate the claims of Catholicism, and strangely enough, agreat proportion of those who entered the Church in consequence were ministers of the Protestant churches. The Native-American movement (1837-44) aroused thousands to learn more about an institution which was being pilloried in hundreds of Protestant newspapers as a blight upon society and as thoroughly incompatible with American ideals; with the result that a wonderful harvest of conversions was reaped during these years.

The Oxford Movement in England (1845-60) was brought to America through one of the most dramatic incidents in the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and these years saw an ever-increasing stream of men and women, of high social and civic station seeking refuge within the fold of the Catholic Church. No one has as yet attempted to describe these years in their entirety, although many lists have been prepared for the future historian. Notable among these are the authoritative essays of Dr. Scannell O'Neill, who has made the story of conversions in the United States his lifework.

Some names should be mentioned, since their accession to Catholic ranks brought to the Church a new vitality which prepared her for the mad frenzy of know-nothing days. Chief among these converts were: Orestes A. Brownson, who was received into the Church, by Bishop Fitzpatrick of Boston in 1844; Bishop Levi Stillman Ives of the Protestant Episcopal church of North Carolina, who became a Catholic in 1852, and whose "Trials of the Mind" (Boston 1854), was recently revived in our memories when the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Delaware, Dr. Frederick Joseph Kinsman, published the story of his conversion in that remarkably book "Salve Mater" (1920); and James Roosvelt Bayley, the newphew of Mother Seton, who was received into the Church at Rome in 1842 and who became Archbishop of Baltimore in 1872.

About this time also (1844-46) occurred that series of remarkble conversions--Hecker, Hewit, Baker, Deshon, and Walworth, who founded the Congregation of St. Paul (Paulists) in 1858.

Vitality of the Faith.

The trial-balance of the good and the evil which have come out of the anti-Catholic movements up to the present gives and overwhelming proof of the vitality of the Catholic Faith to attract all who are seeking the true Church of Christ. Not all those who became Catholics during these turbulent periods of the past are known to the historian; but anyone who will study the sources at his disposal will find that "the ranks of the converts have been marshalled fromthe morally and intellectually superior class of our American people." As a result of the social and literary activites of our converts, the Protestant anti-papal tradition has in course of time become greatly mitigated among the better educated classes of non-Catholics. Most Protestants today--to use a phrase from Chesterton's "Catholic Church and Conversions," are just sufficiently enlightened to be out of the reach of Maria Monk.

Article XXXVIII--"Poisoning the Wells"

(Our Sunday Visitor, September 23, 1928)

Of all the legacies inherited by the modern world from the religious catastrophes of the sixteenth century, foremost in its potency for social and intellectual disorder is hatred for the CatholicChurch. While inseparable from the existence of the Church on earth, this hatred was crystallized into fixed principles by the leaders of that religious revolt, commonly known as Protestantism.

This hatred is the most deep-seated thing in the Protestant heart. Itspopular manifestation was known almost to our own day as No-Popery. No pathway to the mind was untravelled by its supporters and promoters.

From the cradle to the grave anti-papal thought and feeling dominated the souls of millions of non-Catholic Christians, rich and poor, learned and unlearned.

"No Popery" Political "Wolf Cry"

Some of its political phases we have seen in these papers. No-Popery spells in fact the whole of the colonial period of American history. It ruled the whole of the Protestant England from the martyrdoms under Elizabeth to its last fearful outbreak in the Godon Riots of London in 1780. It has been the "wolf" cry of modern politics under the guise of anti-clericalism. No-Popery is the nakedest thing set adrift in the stream of life. Cover its body with the habilments of philasophic or politican cant, and its eyes and ears and mouth are lecherous, sensual and avaricious. Cover its gluttonous eyes, and the stark ugliness of its body is heightened. It is a leper that has escaped the healing shadow of the Master. No one has ever honestly loved it. Many have used it to contaminate a generation devoted to good fellow ship and religious peace. Strongest of allthe vile shibboleths against the Catholic faith, No-Popery has survived the corroding rust of time. Great minds have risen up to combat it during the past four hundred years, but it lives on in ignorant and fanatical hearts.

we have in print too many autobiographies of eminent con-

verts in the United States to deny the all-pervading evil of this anti-Catholic menace. The text books in the colonial school-boys' hands--even those for the study of arithmetic, chemistry and the classics--were vehicles of its spirit. The denominational schools and colleges of colonial America were vibrant with the religious hatred their teachers had inherited from England and Ireland and especially from Scotland. It was a hatred which ignored no group in social, political or professional life. Even after the nation's rise, it followed the Catholic everywhere he went; it stood between him and his soul's peace as he lay dying in sectarian hospitals; it bared him officially from his priests after his entrance into the American army or navy; it damned him to political inferiority in village, town and city. Of those three wide avenues to the public mind--the school, the stage and the press--in the latter No-Popery practically reigned supreme up to the beginning of the present twentieth century.

Christian patience and forbearance were unable longer to brook this anti-Catholic arrogance, and at last a courageous leader flung a message across the country to his Catholic fellow-citizens which called a halt to the ridiculous assertions and clumsy calumnies of our enemies.

The Catholic Encyclopedia

That leader was the founder of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" the Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J., of New York City.

The encyclopedia was one of the great gifts of the Catholic Church to the civilization of theMiddle Ages. The first of these compilations is credited to Isidore of Seville (560-636), and the noblest medieval work of this kind was the famous "speculum" or "Mirror" of Vincent of Benuvais (d. 1264). The freethinkers of the middle-eighteenth century in France saw the value of the encyclopedia as a weapon against Christianity, and under such well known encyclopedists as Bayle, Diderpt and d'Alembert the spirit of irreligion was brought to the masses, and the way was prepared for the French Revolution. In 1771, the first edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica" in ten volumes was begun and its ninth edition in twenty-four volumes was published in 1875-89. Chamber's "Encyclopedia" in ten volumes was issued in London in 1860-68, and it found several imitators on this side of the Atlantic. Among these was Appleton's "Universal Encyclopedia and Atlas."

At the beginning of the present century new editions of some of these encyclopedias were begun. It was earnestly hoped by Catholic scholars and scientists that all those subjects of special interest to the Church's doctrine, discipline, and history would be revised. But the tenth edition of the "Britannica" was put on the market with scarcely any recognition of the advance in scholarship which had vindicated the Church's position in innumerable ways. "In the "Month" for May, 1902, the editor, Father John Gerard, S. J., wrote: "How long is every assertion, however ridiculous, to be at once accepted, or at least tolerated, if only it tends to discredit the Catholic Church? How long in regard to her and of her alone, are the rules of criticism and common sense to be cast to the winds? How long shall the well-meaning and usually not unintelligent multitude be scared away from her by clumsy calumnies which proclaim themselves as frauds far more clearly than do the tatterdemalion figures set by farmers with the vain purpose of keeping the crows out of their cornfield."

Fr. Wynne Exposes Protestant Unfairness

In two articles entitled "Poisoning the wells" in the "Messenger of the Sacred Heart" (June-July, 1902), Father Wynne took up this question from the American standpoint with regard to the popular "Appleton" and "Britannica" and proved with consummate skill that it was useless to hope for fair-play from their Protestant editors. He showed by citations from articles on all those subjects which entered the Catholic field of thought, how ridiculously untrue was the assertion of the editors that "every attention to accuracy" has been given to the new editions of these two popular encyclopedias.

There is an incident preceding the publication of these two articles which has not yet appeared in print. When it does Catholic Americans may realize now impossible it was at the time for a scholar as well known as Father Wynne to secure even a modicum of justice and honesty in the fight he was making upon Protestant prejudice and ill-will toward the Catholic faith. Entire articles, he tells us, were but a wild medley of assertions which reminded one of the bitter sectarian tracts distributed by certain book concerns and mission bureaus. When he realized that the object of these encyclopedias was to insist upon the pretended intellectual superiority of Protestants and that no amount of honest criticism would change that attitude, Father Wynne then inaugurated the project of the "Catholic Encyclopedia"--the great triumph of Christian science in the English tongue, as the "Dublin Review" characterized it upon its conpletion.

The day of these storehouses "of antiquated Protestant traditions and misrepresentations of our religious belief and history," was over, when in December, 1904, a little group of scholars, with Father Wynne as their inspiration, met for the purpose of creating a Catholic Encyclopedia on the constitution, doctrine, discipline and history of the Catholic Church. The late Dr. Charles G. Hebermann, who had been professor of Latin Language and Literature in theCollege of the City of New York since 1869, was chosen editor-in-chief. Associated with him were the Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., then professor of Church History and Patrology at the Catholic University of America; the Rt. Rev. Edward A. Pace, D. D., Professor of PHilosophy at the Catholic University of America; and Dr. Conde Benoit Pallen, the leading Catholic literatuer of the day.

The story of this greatest Catholic undertaking in English-speaking lands in the first quarter of the twentieth century has been told briefly in a volume entitled "The Catholic Encyclopedia and Its Makers," which was published in 1917. Actual work on the "Encyclopedia" was begun in January, 1905. The first volume appeared in March, 1907, and the last volume, the sixteenth, in April, 1914. During that time the editors held nearly 140 meetings to discuss the plan, scope and progress of the work.

Contributors by Nationalities.

In an illuminating essay on the history of the "Catholic Encyclopedia," Paul H. Linehan has summed up the chief characteristics of the work. The result of this decade of labor was that "the contributors, about fifteen hundred in number and representative of forty-three countries, formed an international group of Catholic scholars. The United States furnished five hundred and fifty-nine contributors; England, one hundred and sixty-four; France, one hundred and nineteen; Ireland, one hundred and eighteenp and Germany, one hundred and five. Eighty-eight wrote from Canada; sixty-three from Belgium; thirty-five from Italy. From Spain, Holland and Austria came, respectively, twenty-six, twenty-three, and twenty-one. Articles were not only submitted in English, but in French, German, Spanish, Italian, Dutch, Ertuguese and Latin. Of the ecclesiastics who wrote, four hundred and seven were members of the secular clergy and five hundred and five, representing sixty-four religious institutes of men, belonged to the regular clergy. Religious congregations of women, to the number of forty-four, were represented by fifty-eight contributors. Lay writers numbered four hundred and fifty-six men, and eighty-seven women. Of those, three hundred and forty-seven were teachers, ninety-two journalists, seventy-one lawyers, nine medical men, five architects and two archeologists. The leading Catholic institutions of learning contributed through members of their faculties. In the United States such secular

universities and colleges as Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, University of Pennsylvania, Leland Stanford, Ohio State University and the College of the City of New York were represented."

The claim has justly been made that no work has ever been produced by the joint labors of so many Catholic men and woemen representing the clergy, the laity, the professions, and the various lines of scientific and literary activity. Over one hundred and fifty assistants were required to see the entire work through the press. There were fifty-seven translators for the articles written in foreign tongues and the sixteen volumes of the "Catholic Encyclopedia" contain about sixteen million words.

Work Won General Praise.

No work of this kind has ever received such universal praise. The editors did not claim absolute perfection in all the thirty thousand subjects dealt with in its pages, but on all sides, from Catholics and Protestants, a veritable chorus of jubilation was to be heard as volume succeeded volume in this unique contribution to Catholic scholarship. Many of these encomiums are given by Dr. Paul H. Linehan in his article on the "Catholic Encyclopedia" in the "Catholic Builders of the Nation," which we have quoted above. Even the very bookmaking was held up as a new departure in the art.

The Catholic Question in the United States has been treated in all its phases in the pages of the "Catholic Encyclopedia." Students of American Church history and those who are desirous of making themselves thoroughly familar with the story of the political and social barriers raised by Protestant bigots to halt the steady advance of the Catholic Faith in this country need but to turn to the excellent "Reading List" and the Index of the "Encyclopedia" to find quickly and adequately the main facts of all these anti-Catholic movements as well as directions for further study and reading.

At last, in English-speaking lands, where the Protestant traditional viewpoint had been for so many centuries a barrier to an honest and impartial understanding of the Church, Catholics possessed a platform of the highest scientific type from which to carry on their age-long effort to curtail, if not to demolish, the ignorance, bigotry and fanaticism which have been through four centuries the obstacles to religious peace and understanding.

Article XXXIX--A Trial Balance

(Our Sunday Visitor September 30, 1928)

With the martyrdom of the Venerable Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, at Tyburn in 1681, the bloody persecution of Catholics in the British Isles came to an end, and from that date up to Catholic Emancipation in 1829 the whole force of Protestant intolerance was flung into a savage and ruthless effort to prevent Catholics from exercising equal civic rights or privileges.

Out of this inheritance, as we have seen, came our colonial legacy of No-Popery which barred Catholics in the American colonies from the franchise. The declaration of religious freedom and the principles of non-interference by the State in religious affairs, which became part of the Federal Constitution of 1787, had an appreciable effect upon Catholic disabilities in Great Britain and can be logically linked with the Act of Emancipation passed by Parliament forty-two years later.

During this latter period of the Protestant attack upon Catholic doctrines and discipline, many have been the fruitless attempts on the part of sincere religious minds on both sides of the politico-religious controversy to bring about a better understanding among non-Catholics of Catholicism itself.

The volume of this apologetical literature has become so vast during the last hundred years that its appraisal is beyond the limits of a short article. Many attempts toward Church unity among Christians have likewise been made, especially within recent years; and here and there we learn of conferences held by members of the leading Christian denominations with Catholic scholars for the purpose of clearing away what Cardinal Newman called "the absurdities which are firmly believed of Catholics by sensible, kind-hearted, well-intentioned Protestants."

Commission On Religious Prejudices.

The story of the Catholic Question in the United States would lack an important chapter if we were to pass over in silence one of the noblest of these attempts at religious peace-making, namely, the work done by the Commission on Re-

ligious Prejudices of the Knights of Columbus. This first official effort to make a trial balance of the conflict is now thirteen years old; and if it be measured by the anti-Catholicism which the nation has witnessed since 1915, there is a salutary lesson to all of us who deplore the continuance of the Puritan blight in the land.

Benedict Elder has written for the "Catholic Builders of the Nation" an excellent account of the Commission on Religious Prejudices which he styles, and rightly so, one of the most notable contributions to the cause of religious liberty since Lord Baltimore's Act of Toleration. When the commission was announced at the annual convention of the Knights of Columbus in 1914, its object was not understood by many who had borne the burden of the fight for emancipation from American No-Popery. One editor wrote that he failed to see just what practical effects have followed from the work of the Commission, since its Report "might have been written by any of its members sitting inhis quiet study." Another editor whose judgment on all Catholic American affairs has been at fault, called the work of the Commission a wild-goose chase and wasteful folly.

Object of the Inquiry.

The object of the Commission's inquiry was not to catalogue all the objections against Catholicism nor was it the selection of some of the more virulent charges for rebuttal. The object was principally to awaken American citizens everywhere "to the sinister evil of organized bigotry, which divides the people into warring groups and classes and destroys all prospect, all hope, of preserving the mutuality of good will which has been the triumph of American democracy."

Like everything planned and undertaken by the Knights of Columbus the Commission went about its work in a thorough manner. They understood exactly the purpose of their plan. It was not to usurp the defense of the Church from those whose authority and duty it was to lead in that defense. "No special religious duty was apparent," writes Mr. Elder, "but the civil duty was plain. Moreover it was urgent. The rights of citizens were menaced; the structure of citizenship was endangered; the elemental relations of life in society were agitated, strained. Some counter action was necessary to break the force of the thing and at least forestall such a climax of excitement as only a generation before had staged the barbarous spectacle of a "Bloody Monday" in our land."

There is no exaggeration in these words. The lesson is written too deeply into the recent past for Catholics to forget for a moment that bigotry organized upon Nativistic principles is the most dangerous incentive to violence and bloodshed in the social life of the United States. Hence, the Commission received its mandate "to study the causes, investigate conditions

and suggest remedies for the religious prejudice that has been manifest through press and rostrum in a malicious and scurrilous campaign that is hostile to the spirit of American freedom and liberty and contrary to God's law to 'love they neighbor as thyself.'"

On this broad and patriotic ground, Mr. Elder tells us, the Commission's survey marked an epoch in the history of bigotry campaigns "by setting them in the light of opposing not religious truths merely, but civic truth, civic rights, civic ideals, and all standards of civic decency as well."

The appeal of the Commission was not to Catholics alone, but to the entire country to unite in putting an end forever to religious intolerance.

The work of the Commission grew to such an unexpected volume that the final Report was not ready until August, 1917. Meetings were held in many cities. Men and women of standing in the various professions and in business were interviewed. Letters were sent out by the thousands, and millions of pamphlets and books were distributed; newspapers were enlisted in the cause, and "only the professional bigot, the paid propagandist, the unscrupulous politican, and those of like kidney who were in some way reaping profit or position by the agitation of hatred among men" were found missing among groups that lent cheerful assistance to this patriotic enterprise of the Knights of Columbus.

Results of Commission's Work.

The result was all that the most optimistic could have expected, we are told in the Report of Colonel P. H. Callahan of Louisville, Ky., who was the Chairman of the Commission. Among these results not the least was the failure of scores of anti-Catholic newspapers as well as the failure of anti-Catholic legislation in over forty State Legislatures. "Not that bigotry is dead," Colonel Callahan said, "not by any means; that will never be. But the wave of bigotry that a little while ago was spreading over the country has subsided and its bitter waters lie stagnant."

The Commission found in its investigations that the No-Popery spirit was supported by three classes of Americans--those whose patriotism stops short of the constitutional provision regarding freedom of religious worship; those whose purpose is to destroy not only the Catholic religion, but all religion and all duly constituted government; and those who "despite their expressed motives of higher purpose, are actuated solely by sordid mercenary consideration."

The chief result of this important inquiry was that during these years a propaganda of national proportions was carried on with the aid of prominent non-Catholics to teach Americans of every creed that this is the land where hatreds of all kinds must not be allowed to live. The good accomplished by the Commission was incalculabel. During the last anti-Catholic movement, that of the Klan, there was more than a harkening back to Reconstruction days in the adoption of the mask and hood for its members. Intolerance dared not show its face publicly.

Guiding Principles of Investigation.

The guiding principles of the Commission were those which patriotic Americans of all classes might adopt, and in the general conclusion reached by the Commission all might well concur, namely, that an intolerant movement "can do no harm to the Catholic Church and no good to any other religion; while it is the very ruin of peaceful life in communities."

The Knights of Columbus have written their patriotism in rubric letters into our national history. In peace as in war their representatives in the fields of social service and Christian charity have won the esteem of the entire people. Among all the works undertaken by this great fraternal organization during the past forty years, that of the Commission on Religious Prejudices has shown the way towards an adequate solution of the Catholic Question in the United States.

Article XL--Catholicism and Americanism.

(Our Sunday Visitor, October 7, 1928)

Under this title may justly be placed all the sermons and addresses delivered by Archbishop John Ireland during the thirty years he was one of the truly great figures in the American hierarchy.

From John Carroll to John England, from John Hughes to John Ireland, the span of Catholic life in the United States stretches like a great road with over one hundred and thirty years as milestones along the way. Carroll found his counterpart a half-century after his death when another great Marylander, James Gibbons, began his phenomenal career as a churchman. John England and John Hughes found their logical successor in the first Archbishop of St. Paul. In the history of the Catholic Question in the United States, John Ireland stands apart from all the leaders of his own day and from all who preceded him in the American hierachy.

Tribute of Cardinal Gibbons.

Whatever may be the characteristics which render him a difficult subject for the biographer, John Ireland's part in the gradual softening of the No-Popery spirit in the United States was as important in its own sphere as was that of his life-long friend, Cardinal Gibbons. Only two years after John Ireland became Archbishop of St. Paul (1888), the Cardinal wrote to Pope Leo XIII: "There is no prelate in the United States who has done more to elevate and advance the Catholic religion here than Archbishop Ireland. He is honored and admired by the whole community. Protestants regard him as a peerless and uncompromising advocate of the Catholic faith, and Catholics venerate him as a grand and eloquent exponent of their religion. They almost idolize him."

Archbishop Ireland published very few of his addresses and sermons during his lifetime, but in his "Church and Modern Society" his clean-cut Americanism will remain forever undimmed. He approached the Catholic Question with the same

spirit but in a quite different manner from Cardinal Gibbons. The Cardinal was not an eloquent orator as was his distinguished colleague. John Ireland's education was mainly gained in schools in France and he imbibed many of the mannerism of the French pulpit. Father Cavanaugh of Notre Dame says of him: "He loved the dramatic, he abhorred the commonplace...Earnestness and sincerity contribute largely to the impressiveness of a speaker, and these qualities the Archbishop possessed to a high degree, and supplementing these were his great twin passions--love of Church and love of country." We never have had, in the opinion of this same judicious critic, a Catholic American orator who wielded so powerful an influence over non-Catholic audiences as did John Ireland. It is this factor in his career which gives him a place all his own in the history of the Catholic Question in the United States.

His First Great Public Speech.

His first great public speech was given in the Baltimore Cathedral at the opening of the Congress of Catholic Laymen at Baltimore in 1889. Every word of that remarkable discourse deserves to be known by those who are still blinded by the false light of the Puritan No-Popery sentiment. John Ireland swept aside the old moorings of the past in this most eloquent of all his discourses. It ook sublime courage in that day to tell his hearers--and indeed all America was his audience--that "the great work which in God's providence the Catholics of the United States are called to do within the coming century" was "to make America Catholic and to solve for the Church Universal the all-absorbing problem with which the age confronts her."

To make America Catholic--because the Catholic Faith alone is the dispenser of the truths and graces of salvation; because the Church alone can pour upon the souls of our fellow-citizens the gifts of the Incarnate God; because the touch of her divine-made hand can strengthen the rich heritage of natural virtues in the hearts of the American people; because she can superadd to these the deifying treasures of supernatural life; because she can confirm and preserve, as no other human church can, the liberties of the Republic.

This is the theme in his own words. The logic of his discourse is close and trenchant. There is no escaping his argument. "The centre of gravity for human action," he said nearly forty

years ago, "is rapidly shifting, and in the not distant future America will lead the world." With the Church triumphant in America, "Catholic truth will travel on the wings of American influence, and with it encircle the universe." He believed America to be at heart a Christian country. "As a religious system," he said, "Protestantism is in hopeless dissolution, utterly valueless as a doctrinal or moral power, and no longer to be considered a foe with which we must count.....the American people need the Church for the preservation and complete development of their natural character and their social order...the American people must look to her to maintain for them in the conscience of citizens the principles of natural equity and of law, without which a self-governing people will not exist, falling ultimately into chaotic anarchy, a prey to ambitious despotism."

Prospect of Conquest for Christ.

Assuredly was this a new note in those days; new, not to Protestants only, but to Catholics also. Catholics had thought of little else but the defense of the Church from the potential, and sometimes actual, violence of the Nativistic groups. Here was a new vision--a vision which contrasted the Church with the dominant tendencies of the age and whichheld out to Catholic America a conquest for Christ that could only be paralleled in Apostolic times.

In the thirty years that remained to John Ireland after the Congress of 1889, these principles were never silent in his sermons and discourses. To him, the typical Catholic layman needed in the United States was one who, umbued with a lively faith in Christ and with a childlike obedience to the Church, measured his patriotism to our country by his efforts to make American the foremost Christian nation in the world. As Dr. Moynihan pointed out shortly after Ireland's death, the greatest task he set himself to accomplish was to "bring the Church and the country into close contact, to dissipate misconceptions, to make the Church understood by his fellow-countrymen."

John Ireland never wavered in his belief that the American people would never allow discrimination against any class of citizens on the ground of religion. Like Newman and Manning in England, Mercier in Belgium, and Von Ketteler in Germany, Ireland won the hearts of the nation he loved.

His Pledge of Patriotism.

His best known address on the Catholic Question is one entitled "Catholicism and Americanism," given some six years before his death. It is in this famous speech that the oft-quoted paragraphs occur: "My religious faith is that of the Catholic Church--Catholicism, integral and unalloyed--Catholicism, unswerving and soul-swaying--the Catholicism taught by the supreme chieftain of the Catholic Church, the Pope, the Bishop of Rome. My civil and political faith is that of the republic of the United States of America--Americanism, purest and brightest, yielding in strength and loyalty to the Americanism of none other American, surpassed in spirit of obedience and sacrifice by that of none other citizen, none other soldier, sworn to uphold in peace and in war America's Star Spangled Banner!"

Between his religious faith and his civil and political faith, between his creed and his country, John Ireland could see no possible cause for discord or contradiction. "What is to be feared from the Catholic Church?" he asks. Unwillingly, he takes up the hypthesis that priest, bishop or Pope might attempt to rule in matters civil and political in the United States, or might attempt to influence Catholic citizens beyond the range of their own orbit of spiritual jurisdiction. "The answer is quickly made," he says, "back to your own sphere of rights and duties--back to the things of God!" They know the Catholic Church little, he adds, "who accuse us of coveting civil and political power that we may dim the splendor of the fairest flower of the garden of Americanism. Our combats, if combats there be, are never against the liberties of America, but in defense of them; never against America, but against such of its sons whose suls never yet have thrilled in full response to its teachings and inspirations."

His Life-Long Message.

To make America Catholic in order that the political ideals of the nation shall be ever safeguarded from the evils that throng in the wake of religious error--this was John Ireland's life-long message to his people. He was not so ignorant of history he avers, or of present conditions as to imagine that the goal was within reach. Meanwhile, the lesson he would teach was that "to the civil and political constitutions of America no harm can come from the spread of Catholicism. Yea--to those institutions Catholicism brings elements most vital to their life and growth--those of a positive, authoritative religion." With the voice of divine authority, he concluded, the Church teaches in season and out of season all those doctrines without which the United States as a nation will one day inevitably decay and become a by-word among the peoples of the earth.

The central purpose of John Ireland's life was to emphasize the harmony and correlation between true Americanism and the doctrines of the Catholic Church. He succeeded far better than those of our generation realize. His influence was felt in intellectual and political circles where few of his colleagues in the American hierarchy were heard. His own American spirit was so unalloyed, so uncompromisingly whole-hearted that none who listened to his words could doubt the great sincerity of the man and the priest behind him. His life and work proved that the American national genius can find at all times in the Catholic spirit, those great civic assets--obedience to authority, respect for another's rights, and love for one's fellowman.

Article XLl--The Ku Klux Klan.

(Our Sunday Visitor, October 14, 1928)

It is becoming the fashion to speak of the Klan in the past tense. Since the Klan's entrance into national politics four years ago, it has undoubtedly suffered the fate of those other anti-Catholic movements which preceded its rise in 1915. Its anti-Catholic programme, however, has not been the cause of the Klan's partial eclipse, but rather popular indignation over the social evils with which the organization is charged. The coming weeks will no doubt see the recrudescence of Klan activity and through it the observer of American life will be given another opportunity of measuring the extent of religious intolerance in this land of freedom.

There are several aspects of the rise of the Ku Klux Klan that contain a lesson for the readers of this series of articles on the Catholic Question in the UnitedStates.

When Colonel William Joseph Simmons stood in the midst of his well-chosen group of thirty-four friends on the top of Stone Mountain, near Atalanta, on the night of that day we Americans have set aside to thank Almighty God for those precious blessings of life, liberty, happiness and prosperity, it is a question whether he foresaw in his financial dreams the future development of his design. "Bathed," he said, "in the sacred glow of the fiery cross, the Invisible Empire was called back from its slumber of a half century to take up a new task and fulfill a new mission for humanity's good and to call back to mortal habitation the good angel of practical fraternity among men." During the next five years (1915-1920), however, the Klan appears to have slumbered on, although occasionally local Klansmen directed their activities against so-called alien enemies, slackers, draft-dodgers, strike-leaders, and unfortunate women, especially the last. For a time, it looked to the outsider as if the new society would disappear, but the ferment was not idle. Many curious reasons have been given for the gradual spread of Klan sympathizers. The gamut has been struck from "inferiority complex" which is said to thrive in certain rural sections of this country, to salacious interpretations of social life based upon Freudian ethics.

Genesis of the Klan.

If one agrees with such careful studies of the Klan as that published in 1924 by Professor Mecklin of Dartmouth, it is clear that the Klan was the logical outcome of one and only one cause-the continuance of anti-Catholic fears, hatreds and prejudices which had not died with the death of the A. P. A. in the 'nineties. The score of years that followed this event was not a closed season to the anti-Catholic mind. Many societies of this nature sprang up in various parts of the country, and some succeeded in gaining national attention for a time. Among these were the Guardians of Liberty, the Knights of Luther, the Stonemen, the Covenanters, and the American Pathfinders. These anti-Catholic groups bridged over the period between the A. P. A. and the reorganized Klan of 1920. The effect of these intermediate societies was seen in the number of newspapers founded or subsidized for the purpose of attacking the Catholic Church. In a pamphlet entitled "Defamers of the Church," issued by Our Sunday Visitor Press, there is a list of over 130 of these periodicals. It was to meet the growing evil that the Knights of Columbus created in 1914 its Commission on Religious Prejudices which has been treated in a former article of this series.

The entrance of the United States into the World War in April, 1917, scattered for a time the gathering storm-clouds of anti-Catholicism in the land. As Maury says in his recent satirical book "The Wars of the Godly," the Kaiserusurped "the place of the Pope as Antichrist in American demonology, and reigned in his stead for nigh four years, or until Edward Young Clarke pulmotored the Klan out of bankruptcy." When this occurred the promoters of the Guardians, the Pathfinders and other groups yielded the anti-Catholic field to the better organized Klansmen.

This organization which for public consumption was to be based upon a threefold prejudice--the Catholic, the Jew, and the Negro--had in decency to wait until the war was over. There were too many gallant Catholics, Jews, and Negroes falling upon the field of battle across the seas to capitalize upon a large scale the prejudices linked with these sections of our people. Not that complete silence reigned. By no means. For, out from Aurora, Missouri, there were sent broadcast each week millions of copies of a disreputable newspaper whose sole purpose was the villification of the Catholic faith and the besmirching of Catholic loyalty. In all truth it may be held that between 1911 and 1919 this most vicious anti-Catholic paper every pub-

lished in the United States sowed the seeds of hatred and violence which were to be reaped later by the Klan in a whirlwind of atrocities that blackened the fair name of American justice.

The Colossal Campaign of Hate.

By the time demobilization was completed, the new leaders of the Klan--Edward Y. Clarke and Mrs Elizabeth Tyler--were ready to begin their colossal campaign of hate. The rest of the Klan's history need not to be retold. In spite of the famous exposure of its aims and activities by the New York World in 1921 and in spite of al that State and Federal investigators revealed of the Klan's palpable treason to American ideals, the society grew until it became a menace to national peace and security. In the autumn of 1922, its founder, Simmons, was retired with the title of Emperor For Life and was succeeded by Hiram Wesley Evans of Dallas, Texas, as Imperial Wizard.

Maury's book is not worth quoting a second time in this article, but the following description of the Klan's progress may be given: "Under Evans' leadership the Klan entered into the third, and at this writing apparently the last, phase of its earthly career. Simmons dreamed of leading a band of twentieth-century American Knights, without fear and without reproach. Clarke rounded up a crew of negro-haters, harlot-floggers, Methodist and Baptist pastors, anti-Catholicmonomaniacs, bootleggers, peanut politicans, dry agents and an indeterminate number of honest people. Evans, dentist, thirty-third degree Mason, he-man, go-getter, dealer in polysyllabic English, led theorder into state and national politics."

Klan's Platform In Campaign.

The part taken under cover by the Klan in the last presidential campaign brought the purpose of the organization before the country, and al keen observers knew then that by the law of politics its career would be brief and end in disintegration. The issues, writes Mecklin, that gave the Klan its temporary vitality did not lend themselves to political success "as is amply shown in the history of theKnow-Nothings and the A. P. A. movement." The Klan may display renewed activity during the rest of the presidential campaign of this year. In fact, Mr. Evans, the Imperial Wizard, has declared, in an article entitled "The Ballots Behind the Ku Klux Klan," that "our work in the coming campaign will be like that of an evangelist; to spread the truth. We shal l try to make the issue so clear that no one may mistake it. We shal l show how Smith is inextricably allied with bossism, with nullification, with alienism, with priest-rule. we shall show what al these mean, what danger they carry--the year 1928 will see the greatest campaign for Americanization in our history." Even an amateur in the study of political government could prophesy the inevitable collapse of the Klan on this platform.

The Klan has occupied a large amount of space since 1920 in our Catholic press and in our current literature, and there can be no doubt whatsoever, that the splendid defense of Catholic loyalty and tradition by the editors of our Catholic newspapers and periodicals, as well as the excellent writings of many priests, laymen and lay-women, did much to arouse non-Catholic Americans to the growing danger in this latest anti-Catholic movement. Little by little the truth about Catholic doctrines penetrated minds that had been closed to all Catholic influence; for, the attack made by the Klan organs, whether against our faith and discipline or against our loyalty to American political and social ideals, was so thoroughly at variance with Catholic life and action that many were led, as in all past anti-Catholic movements, to inquire into the history and organization of an institution so bitterly assailed.

There is a fuldamental spirit of fair play in the average American's heart which can always be counted upon to withold judgment until both sides of an argument are heard. One of the surest proofs of this mental factor in our American life was seen at the time of Governor Smith's timely reply to Mr. Marshall. Practically all our leading newspapers rejoiced in that declaration of principles, not only because it was taken to be a complete answer to current anti-Catholic thought, but especially because it gave hope that at last the end of political controversy on religious matters was near.

That both these opinions were too optimistic, all now know. The anti-Catholic appeal made by the Klan and by those who adhered to its tenets, as undoubtedly in his more dignified way Mr. Marshall does, tapped sources of religious bigotry which can never be dried up, as long as ignorance of Catholicism reigns in a single American heart.

Intellectual Mediocrity of Klansmen.

Mecklin writes in his history of the Klan: "If there is one outstanding fact to be noted of the majority of the Klan members, it is their intellectual mediocrity. Neither the intellectual leaders of the community nor the men of ability in the professions or business tend to identify themselves with the Klan--the Klan is conspicuously lacking in that refinement of sentiment and critical independence of thought which must be possessed by an individual or class that undertakes to shape public opinion in a democracy."

If the Klan did nothing else, its animosity to the Catholic Church--and impartial writers on the subject admit that all other motives for its prejudicial cast of mind were but subterfuges for the same--created considerable interest in Catholic doctrines and practices. The output of books on Catholicism in its relation to American ideals has increased considerably since the decline of the Klan. No single aspect of the Klan attack was new to a generation that witnessed the A. P. A. movement or its forbears, the Know-Nothings and the Native-Americans. All that was brought forth by the Klan press and the Klan speechmakers was as old as the oldest, No-Popery tracts of Elizabeth's day. The use of forgeries, the stirring up of plots against the government, the charge of double allegiance, the cry that the land must be saved for Protestantism--all these are now close to the hoary old age of four hundred years.

It is not a clash of ideals we are facing in such anti-Catholic movements as the Ku Klux Klan. It is not as if Catholicism means one thing and Americanism quite the opposite. It is the crude though shrewd capitalization of the No-Popery prejudice which apparently no amount of public education can eradicate.

Flourished On Falsity.

The Klan will not be the last of these anti-Catholic movements in the United States. Citations from books on the subject of non-Catholics might be given to show that the Klan never had any real justification for its existence, that it flourished by creating false issues, by magnifying hatred and prejudice, or by exploiting an exaggerated sense of patriotic duty, and that its leaders can point to no single constructive movement which came from its ranks.

But with these admissions the case is not closed. There will be other organizations of a similar nature in the future. There will be then, as too often in the past, only one weakness in our Catholic defense during these periods of what John Gilmary Shea called the "decennial madness" of the United States--a lack of knowledge on the part of our people, first, of what the Church teaches on all points at issue in the controversy, and secondly, of the close connection between all such movements and the inner history of Puritan life and progress.

Article XLll--The Church and the Republic.

(Our Sunday Visitor, October 21, 1928)

From the death of John Carroll, the first Archbishop of Baltimore, t o our own times, the greatest single force in lessening the asperity of Anti-Catholic intolerance in the United States was Cardinal Gibbons.

The glamor of the Centennial celebration was still over the land in the autumn of 1877, when James Gibbons entered upon his long residence of forty-three years in Baltimore. His "Faith of our Fathers" was already carrying his name across the country into thousands of homes where few Catholic books had entered. During these years up to the last publication--an article on the "Constitution and George Washington," which appeared in the "Baltimore Catholic Review" in February, 1921--there runs in all his utterances and writings, like a thread of silk, one continuous strain--love of God and of Holy Church and love for the American nation. All this time he stood before the world, Catholic and non-Catholic, as American's foremst example in thought, word and action of that spirit of Christian equality and justice upon which the cherished institutions of our country are firmly based.

The life of James Cardinal Gibbons has many attractive aspects. Intimate and scholarly portrayals of his life have been given in such attractive volumes as "Cardinal Gibbons--Churchman and Citizen," by Rev. Albert F. Smith and Vincent de P Fitzpatrick, and the extended biography of Allen Sinclair Will. We are still too near the Cardinal's passing to be able to give a comprehensive appraisal of all the multifarious matters, ecclesiastical and civil, which crowded the sixty-odd years of his priestly life. As the retrospect lengthens, his statesmanship both as acitizen and as a churchman is becoming better known and his towering public career will place him securely forever among the greatest Americans.

Cardinal Gibbons' Love of America.

One phase of his life stands out today four-squred to the winds that sift so many careers after death--his honest, whole-hearted and judicious love for America. No man of his age proved so conclusively the harmony which exists between Catholic doctrine and discipline and the political idealism which made and has preserved the United States a nation. No man within or without the Catholic Church knew the pulse and temper of America as James Gibbons did. His keen sense of perception enabled him to realize that the most pressing social problem in Church progress was the alleged contradiction between Catholic doctrine on Church and State and the pragmatic political situation of the United States.

Until the Catholic Question of the United States was settled, the Cardinal knew that the century-old charge of double allegiance and of political disloyalty would continue to be made by those who saw profit, political or financial, in its furtherance. He accepted every opportunity to present Catholic principles in their proper light to his fellow-citizens of other faiths on this much-abused question; and his whole life can easily be summed up in a phrase he loved the Catholic Church and the American Republic with an affection that knew no dividing line.

His first important public utterance upon the mutual relations of Church and State in this country was made at the very peak of his ecclesiastical career on the day of his installation in his titular church in Rome, March 25, 1887. With Pope Leo's great encyclical on the Constitution of Christian States as his text, the Cardinal applied to conditions in the United States the principle that the Catholic Church is not committed to any form of civil government, that she adapts herself to all, and that where true liberty exists as in America, her great work of leavening society with the sacred leaven of the Gospel goes on unimpeded, strengthening the arm of legitimate authority and tightening the bonds of peace, happiness and mutual love between the citizens of the nation.

In reviewing the stupendous progress of Catholicism in the United States, the Cardinal stressed the fact that the principal cause for this spiritual advance was "under God andthe fostering vigilance of the Holy See, the civil liberty we enjoy in our enlightened republic." He rejoiced that he was a citizen of "a country where the civil government holds over us the aegis of itsprotection, without interfering with us in the legitimate exercise of our sublime mission as ministers of the Gospel of Christ. Our country has liberty without license, and authority without despotism."

From this day forward the Catholic Question in the United States was to form the main theme of most of the Cardinal's public discourses, and many occasions were to arise in the thirty-four years that followed when his solution of the problem on Church and State effectually settled misunderstandings between the two great Christian groups in our country. With an insight into human life which ranked him above all our leaders during these years, Cardinal Gibbons never made the mistake of choosing the wrong moment to inculcate sound teaching on the Catholic Question.

His Patriotic Appeal in Milwaukee.

Toward the true concept of that Americanism which Pope Leo XIII praised in his celebrated letter of January 22, 1889, the Cardinal had more than once contributed by his remarkable power of political vision. About eight years before (August 20, 1891), in his address at Archbishop Katzer's reception of the pallium at Milwaukee, Cardinal Gibbons reviewed deftly and accurately certain problems of a domestic nature then under discussion in ecclesiastical circles and stirred his audience with an eloquent plea for union in the face of the gigantic task the Catholic Church had to assume in the Americanzation of the foreign-born. "God and our country!--this our watchword. Loyalty to God's Church and to our country!--this our religious and political faith---Next to love for God should be our love for our country....Let us glory in the title of American citizen. We owe our allegiance to one country, and that country is America. We must be in harmony with our political institutions. It matters not whether this is the land of our birth or the land of our adoption. It is the land of our destiny. Here we intend to live and here we hope to die."

Checked Progress of A. P. A.

There is no doubt that the Cardinal's crystal clear patriotism did more to check the progress of the A. P. A. movement than any other influence in the land. The ignorant and intolerant, of course, could not be reached, even by his eloquent voice; and the massing of the lingering groups of No-Popery adherents went on until it became a menace to national peace. When the movement threatened to create the evil ofKnow-Nothing days, Cardinal Gibbons gave the nation a message which should be repeated in these uncertain weeks of a presidential campaign: "It is the duty of leaders of political parties to express themselves without any equivocation on the principles of religious freedom which underlie our Constitution...We are proud to say that in the United States the great Catholic Church has

never used or perverted its acknowledged power by seeking to make politics subservient to its own advancement. Moreoever it is our proud boast that we have never interfered with the civil or political rights of any who may have differed from us in religion. We demand the same rights of any who may have differed from us in religion. We demand the same rights for ourselves and nothing more, and we will be content with nothing less."

The Church and the Republic.

The great Cardinal's best known pronouncement on the Catholic Question in the United States is contained in an article entitled "The Church and the Republic" which appeared in the "North American Review" for March, 1919. This article is the most searching analysis of the Catholic Question every given by an American. All that every Catholic citizen should know about the question which political Nativism attempted to answer by violence, intolerance and proscription, is explained in these limpid pages with complete frankness. "Fifteen millions of Catholics," he writes, "live their lives in our land with undisturbed belief in the perfect harmony existing between their religion and their duties as American citizens. It never occurs to their minds to question the truth of a belief which all their experience confirms. Love of religion and love of country burn together in their hearts. They love their Church as the divine spiritual society set by Jesus Christ...They love their country with the spontaneous and ardent love of all patriots, because it is their country and the source to them of untold blessings. They prefer its form of government before any other. They admire its institutions and the spirit of its laws. They accept the Constitution without reserve, with no desire, as Catholics, to see it changed in any feature. They can with a clear conscience swear to uphold it."

Answered Charges Against Church.

One by one the Cardinal takes up all the charges against the Church made familiar by the No-Popery campaigns of the past. These charges were then being reiterated by two synods of Lutheran and Baptist ministers. Chief among the points of attack was one which these ministers deemed it just and wise to proclaim to the country: "that Catholics cannot be trusted with political office: that they cannot sincerely subscribe to the Federal Constitution; that their loyalty is illogical, being contrary to the teaching of the Church; that their religion is opposed to American liberties; and that they themselves, kept in the dark by their religious guides, are ignorant of the true nature of their Church's doctrines. In sounding forth these charges to American Catholics and to the country in general,

they declare themselves inspired, not by religious antagonism or the desire to profit by a good opportunity, but solely by patriotic solicitude for the permanence of American Institutions."

The Cardinal assured his readers that the Catholic Church had nothing to fear over the pretended collision between Catholicism and loyalty to the government. His confidence, he writes, had never wavered in the belief that "God destines the Catholic Church in this country to be the bulwark of law and order, of liberty, of social justice and purity. I speak that I may put forth whatever strength I have to crush this detestable spirit of intolerance which, if it gained strength, would wreck the peaceof the country and root out charity from the hearts of men."

That a "certain dread of Catholicism" existed in this country, in spite of the loyalty of Catholics, the Cardinal well recognized; and it was known among those with whom he was intimate that he had small hope of the reign of a more liberal spirit among certain non-Catholic groups in this generation. Certainly, if one can judge by the literature on the Catholic Question fromProtestant writers during the present year of 1928, the Cardinal's judgment holds good. He describes this element as follows: "They acknowledge that the Catholic Church in this country is an immense force for the public welfare, raising up native Catholics as patriotic Americans and moulding her foreign-born elements into a homogeneous people. The very sense of her strength, indeed, is in great part the cause of her dread; they fear the danger of a collision between the State and a Church whose head is a foreigner and believes himself the representative of God on earth. Catholic teachering, American principles of Government and existing facts will show how baseless is this apprehension."

Discussed "Twilight Zone."

There follows in this remarkable essay one of the clearest exposition we possess in English on the distinction between the civil and ecclesiastical powers. No answer from any reputable source was made to this part of "The Church and the Republic," although the Cardinal's phrase, a "twilight zone"--he is said to have coined the phrase--has been recently made the object of considerable speculation. The concept of a twilight zone wherein conflict might arise is a false one, the Cardinal asserts, since

such a collision between the two powers will never arise so long as our American liberties are preserved by the State in their fulness. "The admission, however, of the merely theoretical possibility of such a collision," he writes, "keeps alive the apprehension of timid Protestants and is sufficient to determine some of them to deprive Catholics forever of the honor of the Presidency. But if no man were to be considered unless we were certain that under no conceivable circumstances would his conscience come into conflict with any possibly legislation, then the first consideration to qualify a man as candidate for the office would be that he should have no conscience at all."

Little wonder then, that at the time of the Smith-Marshall letters, the "Commonweal" should publish an editorial, "A Voice from the Grave," pointing out that "The Church and the Republic" was a most effective reply to Mr. Marshall's strictures. "Upon the day," the editor wrote, "which decides that a Catholic citizen of theUnited States, possessing all the qualifications which the Constitution lays down, and commanding the unlimited respect of his own commonwealth among free states, is ineligible for the highest federal office because he is a Catholic, the American Constitution may still remain the last imperfect instrument of government in an admittedly imperfect world. But it will not, for any practical purppse, be the Constitution that the old Maryland Cardinal who thought he knew it, died believing and loving."

108388

BQX4321
+G8
v.2

108388

Guilday, Peter Keenan

The Catholic question in the United States

DATE
DE 11 '76

ISSUED TO
Congregation

ARCHABBEY LIBRARY
M +BQX4321.G8 v.2
Guilday, Peter The Catholic question i
3 0764 0011 8932 8